MIT-CTP/4874

Entropic scrambling complexities

Zi-Wen Liu,[1,*] Seth Lloyd,[2] Elton Yechao Zhu,[1] and Huangjun Zhu[3]

[1] *Center for Theoretical Physics and Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*

[2] *Department of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*

[3] *Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Cologne, 50937 Cologne, Germany*

(Dated: March 24, 2017)

arXiv:1703.08104v1 [quant-ph] 23 Mar 2017

Abstract

Scrambling is a process by which the state of a quantum system is effectively randomized. Scrambling exhibits different complexities depending on the degree of randomness it produces. For example, the complete randomization of a pure quantum state (Haar scrambling) implies the inability to retrieve information of the initial state by measuring only parts of the system (Page/information scrambling), but the converse is not necessarily the case. Here, we formally relate scrambling complexities to the degree of randomness, by studying the behaviors of generalized entanglement entropies – in particular Rényi entropies – and their relationship to designs, ensembles of states or unitaries that match the completely random states or unitaries (drawn from the Haar measure) up to certain moments. The main result is that the Rényi-α entanglement entropies, averaged over α-designs, are almost maximal. The result generalizes Page's theorem for the von Neumann entropies of small subsystems of random states. For designs of low orders, the average Rényi entanglement entropies can be non-maximal: we exhibit a projective 2-design such that all higher order Rényi entanglement entropies are bounded away from the maximum. However, we show that the Rényi entanglement entropies of all orders are almost maximal for state or unitary designs of order logarithmic in the dimension of the system. That is, such designs are indistinguishable from Haar-random by the entanglement spectrum. Our results establish a formal correspondence between generalized entropies and designs of the same order.

* zwliu@mit.edu

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 3

II. Preliminaries 7

A. Generalized quantum entropies 7

B. Designs 9

1. Projective t-designs 10

2. Unitary t-designs 11

III. Generalized entropies and random unitaries 12

A. Model: entanglement in the Choi state 12

B. Relevant reduced density operators of the Choi state 13

C. Haar-random unitaries 15

1. General trace formulae 15

2. Large d limit asymptotics, equal partitions 16

3. Finite dimensions 22

D. Unitary designs and their approximates 25

1. Average over unitary designs 25

2. Error analysis: approximate unitary designs 26

E. Hierarchy of entropic scrambling complexities 28

1. Complexities by Rényi entanglement entropy 28

2. Extreme orders: 1- and ∞-scrambling 29

3. Nontrivial moments 30

4. On the gaps between complexities 31

5. Relating to other complexities 32

IV. Generalized entropies and random states 33

A. Haar-random states 33

B. Projective designs 38

1. Tight Page's theorem 38

2. Approximate designs and entropic design complexities 38

C. Hierarchy of Page complexities 40

1. Nontrivial moments 40
2. Gaps between Page complexities 41

V. Concluding remarks 42

Acknowledgments 43

A. Inequalities of Rényi entropies of different orders 43

B. Weak subadditivity of Rényi entropy 44

C. A proof of Lemma 2 45

D. Bounds on the Catalan numbers 46

E. Bounds on the Möbius function 48

F. Bounds on the Weingarten function 49

G. Bounds on the number of permutations with a given genus 50

H. Partially scrambling unitary 53

I. Proof of Lemma 22 55

References 57

I. INTRODUCTION

Scrambling describes a property of the dynamics of closed quantum systems, in which initially localized information spreads out over the whole system, thereby becoming inaccessible locally. The concept of scrambling originates from the study of black holes in quantum gravity [1–3]. If information escapes from a black hole, the thermal nature of the Hawking radiation [4–6] indicates that the state of any matter and information falling into the black hole has been scrambled and so gets lost from the perspective of an external observer. In particular, the "fast scrambling conjecture" [2] states that the fastest scramblers take time

logarithmic in the system size to scramble information, and that black holes are the fastest scramblers.

Scrambling and similar notions play important roles in other areas of physics as well. For example, scrambling is closely related to many-body localization and thermalization (see [7] for a recent review): quantum systems that exhibit localization clearly do not scramble or thermalize, since information of local initial conditions fails to spread, and so remains accessible to local measurements. By contrast, a many-body system that undergoes scrambling moves to states that appear random with respect to local measurement: here, the notion of scrambling can be seen as a form of thermalization at infinite temperature. Quantum chaos is also a close relative of scrambling. Under chaotic dynamics, initially local operators grow to overlap with the whole system (the butterfly effect). That is, chaotic quantum systems are scramblers [8]. In particular, the behaviors of the so-called out-of-time-order (OTO) correlators can probe the growth of local perturbations [9–14]. Their role as diagnostics of chaos has led to the active application of OTO correlators to the study of scrambling [8, 15–17] and many-body localization [18–20].

This work is mainly motivated by two key features of scrambling. First, scrambling of quantum information and the growth of entanglement go hand in hand: information initially present in local perturbations ends up encoded in global entanglement so that it becomes irretrievable by simple measurements. Entanglement captures the nonclassical essence of scrambling, and leads to information-theoretic measures of scrambling such as the entanglement entropy. Second, scrambling can be achieved by a sufficiently random dynamics. The main idea of the foundational paper of this field [1] is to use random dynamics to simulate scrambling behaviors of black holes. That is, scrambling is also related to the generation of randomness.

The goal of this paper is to connect entanglement entropy, given by generalized entropies of different orders, with degrees of randomness, characterized by designs. We establish a strong connection between Rényi entanglement entropies and the degree of randomness induced by designs of the same order, in both the random unitary and random state settings. (We note that a recent paper [16] establishes a related connection between 2α-point OTO correlators and α-designs via frame potentials. However, the average OTO correlators that [16] mainly studies may not directly correspond to entropies in our setting.) Generalized entropies of order α raise the density matrix to the α-th power. The higher the order of the

generalized entropy, the more sensitive that entropy is to nonuniformity in the spectrum of the density matrix. An α-design is an ensemble of states or unitaries whose first α moments are indistinguishable from completely random states or unitaries (drawn uniformly from the Haar measure). The higher the order of the design, the better it emulates the full randomness of the Haar distribution. Our main result is that α-designs induce almost maximal Rényi-α entanglement entropies. Our analysis strengthens known results relating entanglement entropy and randomness, such as Page's theorem [21] for random states and Hosur-Qi-Roberts-Yoshida [8] for random unitaries.

These results allow us to elucidate the tradeoffs involved in creating and characterizing higher degrees of randomness. On the one hand, a completely random unitary channel (drawn uniformly from the Haar measure) certainly scrambles information, but it requires exponentially many local gates and random bits to generate [22]. In fact, 2-designs, which can be efficiently implemented [23–25], can already achieve information scrambling. So, for example, simple quantum circuits can create 2-designs with almost maximal von Neumann entanglement entropy. On the other hand, generalized entanglement entropies of higher orders are more sensitive to nonuniformity (such as sharp peaks) in the spectrum of the reduced density matrix, i.e. the entanglement spectrum [26], which can be invisible to the ordinary (von Neumann) entanglement entropy. Pseudorandom unitaries may typically exhibit almost maximal von Neumann entanglement entropy, but do not necessarily maximize high-order Rényi entanglement entropies. Our results reveal a fine-grained hierarchy of complexities between information and Haar scrambling. This hierarchy is defined relative to the moments of the Haar measure, and can be probed by generalized entanglement entropies. To summarize, we aim at deriving tight relations between entropy and randomness. To do so, we calculate the generalized entanglement entropies averaged over state and unitary designs.

Now we introduce our approaches and results more specifically. To study scrambling properties of unitary channels, we map them to a dual state via Choi isomorphism, and study the entanglement properties of this dual state. As in [8], we partition the input register of the Choi state into two parts, A and B, and the output register into C and D. Our results rely on the calculation of average $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\}$, the defining element of order-α entanglement entropies between AC and BD of the Choi state. We employ tools from Weingarten calculus to explicitly compute the Haar integrals of $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\}$ for all α in both the asymptotic and

nonasymptotic regimes, which are by definition equal to the average over unitary α-designs. We are able to use these results to lower bound the regular Rényi entanglement entropies, as they are convex in $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\}$. The key conclusion is that the Rényi-α entanglement entropies averaged over unitary α-designs are almost maximal. In other words, a random unitary sampled from a unitary α-design typically exhibits nearly maximal Rényi-α entanglement entropies. These results indicate that the Rényi-α entanglement entropies can diagnose the randomness complexity of unitary α-designs. We also study the $\alpha \to \infty$ limit of Rényi, the min entanglement entropy, in particular. We show that unitary designs of an order that scales logarithmically in the dimension of the unitary achieve almost maximal average min entanglement entropy, which implies that they are already indistinguishable from Haar random by the entanglement spectrum alone. Higher moments make no difference in the entanglement spectrum. Then we consider the more straightforward and well-known problem of entanglement in random states. Previous results in this setting, e.g. Page's theorem, are also not tight in a similar sense. We obtain analogous results as in the random unitary setting. Most importantly, we show that (projective) α-designs exhibit almost maximal Rényi-α entanglement entropies, which can be regarded as a tight version of Page's theorem. As in the case of unitary designs, state designs of logarithmic order already maximize min entanglement entropy. Moreover, we are able to show that there exists a projective 2-design such that all higher Rényi entanglement entropies are bounded away from maximum. The existence of such a 2-design establishes a clear separation between the entropic complexity of 2-designs and those of higher orders. Our results reveal intrinsic connections between the order of generalized entropies and the moment of randomness. We also include several results related to e.g. Rényi entropies, designs, and Weingarten calculus, which may be of independent interest.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we formally define the central concepts of this paper: the generalized quantum entropies and designs. Sections III and IV contain analysis of the Choi model of random unitary and the random state settings respectively. Finally we provide some concluding remarks about our results and future directions in Sec. V. Peripheral results and technical details are included in the appendix. See, e.g., [27] for a comprehensive introduction of standard and soft notations of asymptotics (e.g. big-O and soft big-O) that will be used throughout this paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES

The theme of this paper is to establish connections between generalized quantum entropies and designs, which we shall formally introduce in this section.

A. Generalized quantum entropies

Some parametrized generalizations of the Shannon and von Neumann entropy, most importantly the Rényi and Tsallis entropies, are found to be useful in both classical and quantum regimes. We will find that Rényi entropies are more suitable for characterizing scrambling than Tsallis entropies. Here we focus on entropies defined on a quantum state ρ living in a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. A unified definition of generalized quantum entropies is given in [28, 29]:

Definition 1 (Quantum unified entropies)**.** The quantum unified (α, s)-entropy of a state ρ is defined as

$$S_s^{(\alpha)}(\rho) = \frac{1}{s(1-\alpha)} \left[(\mathrm{tr}\{\rho^\alpha\})^s - 1 \right]. \tag{1}$$

The two parameters α and s are respectively referred to as the order and the family of an entropy in this paper.

The $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho^\alpha\}$ element plays a key role in this paper. Entropies specified by a certain order α are collectively called α entropies. The $\alpha \to 1$ limit gives the von Neumann entropy. By fixing s, one obtains a family of entropies parametrized by order α. We define the following function to be the characteristic function of an entropy:

$$f_s^{(\alpha)}(x) = -\frac{x^s - 1}{s(1-\alpha)}, \tag{2}$$

which is obtained by treating $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho^\alpha\}$ as the argument x. The convexity of this characteristic function is important to many of our results.

The most representative families are Rényi (the limiting case $s \to 0$) and Tsallis ($s = 1$). However, $s > 0$ entropies (e.g. Tsallis) have some undesirable features for our purposes. Most importantly, the maximal value is dependent on α, thus it does not make much sense to directly compare $s > 0$ entropy of different orders α, which is key to our results. Moreover, they are not even additive on maximally mixed states, so on runs into trouble when deriving

e.g. tripartite information from entanglement entropy. In addition, notice that for $s > 1$ (excluding Tsallis), the characteristic function is concave in the relevant $\alpha > 1$ regime, which prevents us from using Jensen's inequality to establish several crucial bounds. These problems will be explained in more detail later.

In contrast, Rényi entropies do not have these problems. In this work, we mainly focus on this well-behaved family:

Definition 2 (Quantum Rényi entropies)**.** The quantum Rényi-α entropy of a state ρ is defined as

$$S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \mathrm{tr}\{\rho^\alpha\}. \tag{3}$$

For $\alpha = 0, 1, \infty$, $S_R^{(\alpha)}$ is singular and defined by taking a limit. $S_R^{(0)}(\rho) = \log \mathrm{rank}$ is the max/Hartley entropy; $S_R^{(1)} = -\mathrm{tr}\rho \log \rho$ is just the von Neumann entropy. The $s \to \infty$ limit, the min entropy, plays a special role in our study:

Definition 3 (Quantum min entropy)**.** The quantum min entropy of a state ρ is defined as

$$S_{\min}(\rho) = -\log \|\rho\| = -\log \lambda_{\max}(\rho), \tag{4}$$

where $\|\rho\|$ denotes the operator norm of ρ, $\lambda_{\max}(\rho)$ is the largest eigenvalue of ρ.

Other Rényi entropies are well-defined by Eq. (3). The $\alpha = 2$ case $S_R^{(2)}(\rho) = -\log \mathrm{tr}\{\rho^2\}$, often called the Rényi-2 or collision entropy, is also a widely used and highly relevant quantity. In the context of scrambling, a key result of [8] is that the Rényi-2 entanglement entropy is directly related to the 4-point OTO correlators, thus can probe chaos. Ref. [17] also discusses scrambling in a Wess-Zumino-Witten model using this quantity. Also notice that $S_R^{(2)}$ is directly related to the quantum purity $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho^2\}$ (recall that less pure subsystems dictate entanglement), and is so frequently employed in the study of entanglement [30, 31]. It can be directly verified that Rényi entropies are additive and have the same maximal value n for n qubits.

An important feature of Rényi entropy for analyzing degree of scrambling is that the values of Rényi entropy of different orders can in principle be well gapped: consequently, the behavior of states and unitaries at different orders of Rényi entropy can be used to distinguish between different degrees of scrambling. Here we give a simple example. Consider a density

operator in d-dimenisonal Hilebert space has one large eigenvalue $1/\sqrt{d}$, and the rest of the spectrum is uniform/degenerate. That is, the spectrum reads

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}, \underbrace{\frac{1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}}{d-1}, \cdots, \frac{1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}}{d-1}}_{d-1}\big). \tag{5}$$

Then the min entropy only cares about the largest eigenvalue by definition:

$$S_R^{(\infty)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = -\log \lambda_{\max} = \frac{1}{2}\log d, \tag{6}$$

which is $\Theta(\log d)$ (linear in the number of qubits) away from maximum. However, Rényi-2 is insensitive to this single peak:

$$S_R^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = -\log\left(\frac{1}{d} + (d-1)\left(\frac{1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}}{d-1}\right)^2\right) = \log d - \log\left(1 + \frac{d(1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}})^2}{d-1}\right) \geq \log d - 1, \tag{7}$$

which is almost maximal (with a residual constant). This establishes a clear separation between the low and high ends of Rényi entropies. In fact, λ produces $\Theta(\log d)$ gaps between all finite orders:

$$S_R^{(\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\left(\frac{1}{d^{\alpha/2}} + (d-1)\left(\frac{1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}}{d-1}\right)^{\alpha}\right) \approx \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha-1)}\log d, \tag{8}$$

for $\alpha > 2$. So the slope decreases with α. Indeed, it equals 1 for $\alpha = 2$, and approaches $1/2$ in the $\alpha \to \infty$ limit. The intuition is simply that promoting the power of eigenvalues essentially amplifies the nonuniformity of the spectrum. Similar separations will be constructed in the random state setting. In the appendix, we derive more properties of Rényi entropies, including inequalities relating different orders of Rényi entropies (Appendix A), and a weaker form of subadditivity (Appendix B).

Fig. 1 summarizes the important generalized entropies in the relevant regime $\alpha, s \geq 0$.

B. Designs

In general, the notion of design is introduced to characterize distributions that can produce the behaviors of certain moments of the uniform distribution, and so can be considered as good approximations to complete randomness. The idea applies to both quantum states and unitary channels, as we shall formally introduce now.



FIG. 1. Unified (α, s)-entropies, $\alpha, s \geq 0$. Italicized names refer to the whole line.

1. *Projective t-designs*

Complex projective designs are distributions of vectors on the complex unit sphere that are good approximations to the uniform distribution (pseudorandom), in the sense that they match the uniform distribution up to certain moments [32–34]. They are of interest in many research areas, such as approximation theory, experimental designs, signal processing, and quantum information. There are many equivalent definitions of exact designs (see [34]). Here we mention a few that are directly relevant to the current study.

Thr canonical definition is based on polynomials of vector entries. Define $\mathrm{Hom}_{(t,t)}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ as the space of polynomials homogeneous of degree t both in the coordinates of vectors in $\mathbb{C}^d$ and in their complex conjugates.

Definition 4 (Projective designs by polynomials)**.** An ensemble ν of pure state vectors in dimension d is a (complex projective) *t-design* if

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu\, p(\psi) = \int p(\psi)\mathrm{d}\psi \quad \forall p \in \mathrm{Hom}_{(t,t)}(\mathbb{C}^d), \tag{9}$$

where the integral is taken with respect to the (normalized) uniform measure on the complex unit sphere in $\mathbb{C}^d$.

The second definition, based on the frame operator, will be useful in the error analysis. Let $\mathrm{Sym}_t(\mathbb{C}^d)$ be the t-partite symmetric subspace of $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes t}$ with corresponding projector

$P_{[t]}$. The dimension of $\mathrm{Sym}_t(\mathbb{C}^d)$ reads

$$D_{[t]} = \binom{d+t-1}{t}. \tag{10}$$

Definition 5 (Projective designs by frame)**.** The t-th frame operator of ν is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_t(\nu) := D_{[t]}\, \mathbb{E}_\nu(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)^{\otimes t}, \tag{11}$$

and the t-th frame potential is

$$\Phi_t(\nu) := \mathrm{tr}\left\{\mathcal{F}_t(\nu)^2\right\}. \tag{12}$$

The ensemble ν is a t-design if and only if $\mathcal{F}_t(\nu) = P_{[t]}$ or, equivalently, if $\Phi_t(\nu) = D_{[t]}$ [34].

2. *Unitary t-designs*

In analogy to complex projective designs, unitary designs are distributions on the unitary group that are good approximations to Haar-random unitaries, in the sense that they match the Haar measure up to certain moments [34–38]. They also play key roles in many research areas, such as randomized benchmarking, data hiding, and decoupling. As in the case of state designs there are also many equivalent definitions of exact unitary designs (see [34]). Similarly, we formally define unitary designs by polynomials and frame operators/potentials.

Let $\mathrm{Hom}_{(t,t)}(\mathrm{U}(d))$ be the space of polynomials homogeneous of degree t both in the matrix elements of $U \in \mathrm{U}(d)$ and in their complex conjugates.

Definition 6 (Unitary designs by polynomials)**.** An ensemble ν of unitary operators in dimension d is a *unitary t-design* if

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu\, p(U) = \int \mathrm{d}U p(U) \quad \forall p \in \mathrm{Hom}_{(t,t)}(\mathrm{U}(d)), \tag{13}$$

where the integral is taken over the normalized Haar measure on $\mathrm{U}(d)$.

Definition 7 (Unitary designs by frame)**.** The t-th frame operator of ν is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_t(\nu) := \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[U^{\otimes t} \otimes U^{\dagger\otimes t}\right], \tag{14}$$

and the t-th frame potential is

$$\Phi_t(\nu) := \mathrm{tr}\left\{\mathcal{F}_t(\nu)^2\right\} \tag{15}$$

The ensemble ν is a unitary t-design if and only if $\mathcal{F}_t(\nu) = \mathcal{F}_t(\mathrm{U}(d))$, where $\mathcal{F}_t(\mathrm{U}(d))$ is the tth frame operator of the unitary group $\mathrm{U}(d)$ with Haar measure [34]. In addition,

$$\Phi_t(\nu) \geq \gamma(t,d) := \int \mathrm{d}U |\,\mathrm{tr}\{U\}|^{2t}, \tag{16}$$

and the lower bound is saturated if and only if ν is a unitary t-design [34, 38, 39]. When $t \leq d$, which is the case we are mostly interested in,

$$\gamma(t,d) = t!. \tag{17}$$

III. GENERALIZED ENTROPIES AND RANDOM UNITARIES

We first study the scrambling properties of random unitary channels. As suggested by [8], we employ the Choi isomorphism to map a unitary channel to a dual state, and study scrambling by the entanglement properties of this state. In this section, we first briefly introduce the Choi state model, and then present several calculations of averaged generalized entanglement entropies. The results lead to an entropic notion of scrambling complexities, which we shall discuss in depth.

A. Model: entanglement in the Choi state

Ref. [8] proposed that one can use the negativity of the tripartite information associated with the Choi state of a unitary channel to probe scrambling. The negativity of the tripartite information is a measure of global entanglement that quantifies the degree to which local information in the input to the channel becomes non-local in the output. Here we introduce the definitions and motivations of this formalism to set the stage.

The Choi isomorphism (more generally, the channel-state duality) is widely used in quantum information theory to study quantum channels as states. It says that a unitary operator U acting on a d-dimensional Hilbert space $U = \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} U_{ij}|i\rangle\langle j|$ is dual to the pure state

$$|U\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i,j=0}^{d-1} U_{ji}|i\rangle_{in} \otimes |j\rangle_{out}, \tag{18}$$

which is called the Choi state of U. Now consider arbitrary bipartitions of the input register into A and B, and the output register into C and D. Let d_A, d_B, d_C, d_D be the dimensions of subregions A, B, C, D respectively ($d_A d_B = d_C d_D = d$). One expects that, in a scrambling system, any measurement on local regions of the output cannot reveal much information about local perturbations applied to the input. In other words, the mutual information between local regions of the input and output $I(A:C)$ and $I(A:D)$ should be small. This suggests that the negative tripartite information

$$-I_3(A:C:D) := I(A:CD) - I(A:C) - I(A:D) \tag{19}$$

can diagnose scrambling, since it essentially measures the amount of information of A hidden nonlocally over the whole output register. Here $I(A:C) = S(A) + S(C) - S(AC)$ is the mutual information, which measures the total correlation between A and C. Since the input and output are maximally mixed due to unitarity, the four subregions are all maximally mixed. For example, here $I(A:C)$ is reduced to $\log d_A d_C - S(AC)$, so we only need to analyze the entanglement entropy $S(AC)$. Note that $-I_3$ can be reduced to the conditional mutual information $I(A:B|C)$ [40], which is a quantity of great interest in quantum information theory.

The Haar-averaged (completely random) values of the terms in the von Neumann I_3 was computed in [8], as a baseline for scrambling. However, it is clear that a pseudorandom ensemble (such as a 2-design) can already reach these roof values [16], which indicates that there is a hierarchy of fine-grained complexities of scrambling, corresponding to different degrees of randomness. This section aims at formalizing this observation in the same Choi state model. We rewrite the information-theoretic quantities in terms of generalized quantum entropies (such as Rényi and Tsallis) of different orders, to study the connections between these entropies and designs.

B. Relevant reduced density operators of the Choi state

By using individual indices for different subregions, we rewrite the Choi state in Eq. (18) as

$$|U\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{klmo} U_{mo,kl} |kl\rangle_{AB} \otimes |mo\rangle_{CD}, \tag{20}$$

where k, l, m, o are respectively indices for A, B, C, D. The corresponding density operator is then

$$\rho_{ABCD} = |U\rangle\langle U| = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\substack{klmo \\ k'l'm'o'}} U_{mo,kl} U^*_{m'o',k'l'} |kl\rangle_{AB}\langle k'l'| \otimes |mo\rangle_{CD}\langle m'o'|. \tag{21}$$

By tracing out BD, we obtain the reduced density operator of AC:

$$\rho_{AC} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\substack{klmo \\ k'm'}} U_{mo,kl} U^*_{m'o,k'l} |k\rangle_A\langle k'| \otimes |m\rangle_C\langle m'|. \tag{22}$$

The entropy of ρ_{AC} measures the entanglement between AC and BD. In order to compute the generalized α entanglement entropies, we need to raise ρ_{AC} to the power α:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^\alpha_{AC} = \frac{1}{d^\alpha} \sum_{\text{all indices}} \quad & U_{m_1o_1,k_1l_1} U^*_{m_2o_1,k_2l_1} U_{m_2o_2,k_2l_2} U^*_{m_3o_2,k_3l_2} \cdots \\ & U_{m_\alpha o_\alpha,k_\alpha l_\alpha} U^*_{m_{\alpha+1}o_\alpha,k_{\alpha+1}l_\alpha} |k_1\rangle\langle k_{\alpha+1}| \otimes |m_1\rangle\langle m_{\alpha+1}|.\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Thus

$$\operatorname{tr}\{\rho^\alpha_{AC}\} = \frac{1}{d^\alpha} \sum_{\text{all indices}} U_{m_1o_1,k_1l_1} U^*_{m_2o_1,k_2l_1} U_{m_2o_2,k_2l_2} U^*_{m_3o_2,k_3l_2} \cdots U_{m_\alpha o_\alpha,k_\alpha l_\alpha} U^*_{m_1o_\alpha,k_1l_\alpha}. \tag{24}$$

This result can also take more concise operator forms:

$$\operatorname{tr}\{\rho^\alpha_{AC}\} = \frac{1}{d^\alpha} \operatorname{tr}\left\{(U \otimes U^*)^{\otimes\alpha} X_\alpha\right\} = \frac{1}{d^\alpha} \operatorname{tr}\left\{(U \otimes U^\dagger)^{\otimes\alpha} Y_\alpha\right\}, \tag{25}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} X_\alpha := \sum_{\text{all indices}} \quad & |m_1o_1\rangle\langle k_1l_1| \otimes |m_2o_1\rangle\langle k_2l_1| \otimes |m_2o_2\rangle\langle k_2l_2| \otimes |m_3o_2\rangle\langle k_3l_2| \otimes \cdots \\ & \otimes |m_\alpha o_\alpha\rangle\langle k_\alpha l_\alpha| \otimes |m_1o_\alpha\rangle\langle k_1l_\alpha|, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_\alpha := \sum_{\text{all indices}} \quad & |m_1o_1\rangle\langle k_1l_1| \otimes |k_2l_1\rangle\langle m_2o_1| \otimes |m_2o_2\rangle\langle k_2l_2| \otimes |k_3l_2\rangle\langle m_3o_2| \otimes \cdots \\ & \otimes |m_\alpha o_\alpha\rangle\langle k_\alpha l_\alpha| \otimes |k_1l_\alpha\rangle\langle m_1o_\alpha| = X_\alpha^{\Gamma_{\text{even}}}, \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where Γ_{even} denotes partial transpose on even parties. Notice that $Y_\alpha Y_\alpha^\dagger = I$ so Y_α is unitary.

Other density operators can be derived in a similar way. Again note that the input and output are maximally entangled due to unitarity, so all four subregions are maximally mixed.

C. Haar-random unitaries

1. *General trace formulae*

We first employ tools from random matrix theory and in particular Weingarten calculus to study Haar integrals of the trace term in generalized entropies.

It is known that the Haar-averaged value of each monomial of degree α can be written in the following form [41]:

$$\int \mathrm{d}U U_{i_1 j_1} \cdots U_{i_\alpha j_\alpha} U^*_{i'_1 j'_1} \cdots U^*_{i'_\alpha j'_\alpha} = \sum_{\sigma,\gamma \in S_\alpha} \delta_{i_1 i'_{\sigma(1)}} \delta_{j_1 j'_{\gamma(1)}} \cdots \delta_{i_\alpha i'_{\sigma(\alpha)}} \delta_{j_\alpha j'_{\gamma(\alpha)}} \mathrm{Wg}(d, \sigma\gamma^{-1}), \quad (28)$$

where S_α is the symmetric group of α symbols, and

$$\mathrm{Wg}(d,\sigma) = \frac{1}{(\alpha!)^2} \sum_{\lambda \vdash \alpha} \frac{\chi^\lambda(1)^2 \chi^\lambda(\sigma)}{s_{\lambda,d}(1,\cdots,1)} \quad (29)$$

are called Weingarten functions of $\mathrm{U}(d)$. Here $\lambda \vdash \alpha$ means λ is a partition of α, χ^λ is the corresponding character of S_α, and s_λ is the corresponding Schur function/polynomial. Notice that $s_{\lambda,d}(1,\cdots,1)$ is simply the dimension of the irrep of $\mathrm{U}(d)$ associated with λ. The Weingarten function can be derived by various tools in representation theory, such as Schur-Weyl duality [42, 43] and Jucys-Murphy elements [44]. Therefore, we obtain the following general result:

Theorem 1.

$$\begin{aligned}\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho^\alpha_{AC}\right\} =& \frac{1}{d^\alpha} \sum_{\text{all indices}} \int \mathrm{d}U U_{m_1 o_1, k_1 l_1} U^*_{m_2 o_1, k_2 l_1} U_{m_2 o_2, k_2 l_2} U^*_{m_3 o_2, k_3 l_2} \cdots U_{m_\alpha o_\alpha, k_\alpha l_\alpha} U^*_{m_1 o_\alpha, k_1 l_\alpha} \\ =& \frac{1}{d^\alpha} \sum_{\sigma,\gamma \in S_\alpha} d_A^{\xi(\sigma\tau)} d_B^{\xi(\sigma)} d_C^{\xi(\gamma\tau)} d_D^{\xi(\gamma)} \mathrm{Wg}(d, \sigma\gamma^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $\xi(\sigma)$ is the number of disjoint cycles associated with σ [45], and $\tau := (1\ 2\ \cdots\ \alpha)$ is the 1-shift (canonical full cycle).

One can easily recover the $\alpha = 2$ results given in [8] from Eq. (30) as follows. The Weingarten functions for $\sigma \in S_2$ are

$$\mathrm{Wg}(d,\sigma) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d^2-1} & \sigma = I, \\ -\frac{1}{d(d^2-1)} & \sigma = (1\ 2). \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

There are 4 terms corresponding to 2 different Weingarten functions:

$\sigma\gamma$	σ	γ	$\xi(\sigma\tau)$	$\xi(\sigma)$	$\xi(\gamma\tau)$	$\xi(\gamma)$
I	I	I	1	2	1	2
	(1 2)	(1 2)	2	1	2	1
(1 2)	I	(1 2)	1	2	2	1
	(1 2)	I	2	1	1	2

Plugging them into Eq. (30) yields

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^2\} = \frac{1}{d^2}\left(\frac{1}{d^2-1}\left(d_A d_B^2 d_C d_D^2 + d_A^2 d_B d_C^2 d_D\right) - \frac{1}{d(d^2-1)}\left(d_A d_B^2 d_C^2 d_D + d_A^2 d_B d_C d_D^2\right)\right) \tag{32}$$

$$\approx d_A^{-1} d_C^{-1} + d_B^{-1} d_D^{-1} - d^{-1} d_A^{-1} d_D^{-1} - d^{-1} d_B^{-1} d_C^{-1}, \tag{33}$$

which confirms Eq. (66) of [8]. A series of results of [8] such as an $O(1)$ gap between Haar and maximal Rényi-2 entanglement entropy are obtained based on this formula.

More generally, we have

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \left(\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}\right)^s = \frac{1}{d^{s\alpha}} \sum_{\sigma,\gamma\in S_{s\alpha}} d_A^{\xi(\sigma\tau_{\alpha,s})} d_B^{\xi(\sigma)} d_C^{\xi(\gamma\tau_{\alpha,s})} d_D^{\xi(\gamma)} \mathrm{Wg}(d, \sigma\gamma^{-1}), \tag{34}$$

where $\tau_{\alpha,s} := \prod_{r=0}^{s-1}(\alpha r + 1 \ \alpha r + 2 \ \cdots \ \alpha(r+1))$ is the product of canonical full cycles on each of the s blocks with α symbols.

2. *Large d limit asymptotics, equal partitions*

We now analyze the asymptotic behaviors of generalized entropies in the $d \to \infty$ limit to provide a big picture. Later we shall introduce some explicit bounds that hold for general d. To simplify the analysis, we further require that $d_A = d_B = d_C = d_D = \sqrt{d}$ here. That is, all partitions are equal. This does not affect the main idea.

a. Trace We first introduce a series of useful combinatorics lemmas, which play critical roles in the behavior of generalized entanglement entropies (in particular Rényi). These results are known in the context of random matrix theory. We refer to Appendix A of [46] (c.f. references therein) for a good summary of related results. For intuition, we still include our independent proof by induction for the key result Lemma 2 in Appendix C.

Lemma 2. *$\xi(\sigma) + \xi(\sigma\tau) \leq \alpha + 1$ for all $\sigma \in S_\alpha$.*

This result can be obtained by combining Lemmas A.1 and A.4 of [46]. See Appendix C for our proof.

Lemma 3. *Let $g(\alpha)$ be the number of $\sigma \in S_\alpha$ that saturates the inequality in Lemma 2. Then $g(\alpha) = \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha := 2\alpha!/\alpha!(\alpha+1)! = \frac{1}{\alpha+1}\binom{2\alpha}{\alpha}$, i.e., the α-th Catalan number.*

This result follows from Lemmas A.4 and A.5 of [46]. Such permutations lie on the geodesic from identity to τ. It guarantees that the gap between Haar and maximal Rényi entropies is independent of the system size n, as will become clear shortly. We note that Catalan numbers frequently occur in counting problems. The first few Catalan numbers are $1, 1, 2, 5, 14, 42, 132, 429, 1430, 4862, 16796, \cdots$. Some useful bounds on the Catalan numbers are derived in Appendix D.

Corollary 4. *$\xi(\sigma)+\xi(\sigma\tau_{\alpha,s}) \leq s\alpha+s$ for all $\sigma \in S_{s\alpha}$. The number of $\sigma \in S_{s\alpha}$ that saturates the inequality $g(\alpha, s) = g(\alpha)^s = \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha^s = \frac{1}{(\alpha+1)^s}\binom{2\alpha}{\alpha}^s$.*

We also need the large d asymptotic behaviors of the Weingarten function:

Lemma 5 (Asymptotics of Wg [42, 47])**.** *Given $\sigma \in S_\alpha$ with cycle decomposition $\sigma = C_1 \cdots C_k$. Let $|\sigma|$ be the minimal number of factors needed to write σ as a product of transpositions. The Möbius function of σ is defined by*

$$\mathrm{Moeb}(\sigma) := \prod_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^{|C_i|} \mathrm{Cat}_{|C_i|}, \tag{35}$$

where Cat_n is the n-th Catalan number (defined in Lemma 3). In some literature, $|C_i|$ here is written as $|C_i| - 1$ where the $|\cdot|$ actually means the length of the cycle. To avoid confusions, we stick to the number of transpositions notation. Then, in the large d limit, the Weingarten function has the asymptotic behavior

$$d^{\alpha+|\sigma|}\mathrm{Wg}(d, \sigma) = \mathrm{Moeb}(\sigma) + O(d^{-2}). \tag{36}$$

Corollary 6. *We mainly need to distinguish the following two cases:*

- *$\sigma = I$: $|\sigma| = 0$ and $\mathrm{Moeb}(\sigma) = 1$, thus $\mathrm{Wg}(d, I) = d^{-\alpha} + O(d^{-(\alpha+2)})$;*
- *$\sigma \neq I$: $|\sigma| \geq 1$, thus $\mathrm{Wg}(d, \sigma) = O(d^{-(\alpha+|\sigma|)}) = O(d^{-(\alpha+1)})$.*

Some bounds on the Möbius function are derived in Appendix E.

Now we are equipped to derive the asymptotic behaviors of $\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}$:

Theorem 7. *For equal partitions ($d_A = d_B = d_C = d_D = \sqrt{d}$), in the large d limit,*

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\} = \mathrm{Cat}_{\alpha} d^{(1-\alpha)}(1 + O(d^{-1})), \tag{37}$$

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \left(\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}\right)^{s} = \mathrm{Cat}_{\alpha}^{s} d^{(1-\alpha)s}(1 + O(d^{-1})), \tag{38}$$

Proof. Starting from Eq. (30):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\} \\
=&\frac{1}{d^{\alpha}} \sum_{\sigma} (d_A d_C)^{\xi(\sigma\tau)} (d_B d_D)^{\xi(\sigma)} \mathrm{Wg}(d, I) + \frac{1}{d^{\alpha}} \sum_{\sigma \neq \gamma} d_A^{\xi(\sigma\tau)} d_B^{\xi(\sigma)} d_C^{\xi(\gamma\tau)} d_D^{\xi(\gamma)} \mathrm{Wg}(d, \sigma\gamma^{-1}) && (39)\\
=&\frac{1}{d^{\alpha}} \sum_{\sigma} d^{\xi(\sigma\tau)+\xi(\sigma)} \mathrm{Wg}(d, I) + \frac{1}{d^{\alpha}} \sum_{\sigma} d^{(\xi(\sigma\tau)+\xi(\sigma))/2} \sum_{\gamma \neq \sigma} d^{(\xi(\gamma\tau)+\xi(\gamma))/2} \mathrm{Wg}(d, \sigma\gamma^{-1}) && (40)\\
=&\sum_{\sigma} d^{\xi(\sigma\tau)+\xi(\sigma)} (d^{-2\alpha} + O(d^{-(2\alpha+2)})) + \sum_{\sigma} d^{(\xi(\sigma\tau)+\xi(\sigma))/2} \sum_{\gamma \neq \sigma} d^{(\xi(\gamma\tau)+\xi(\gamma))/2} O(d^{-(2\alpha+1)}) && (41)\\
=&\mathrm{Cat}_{\alpha} d^{(1-\alpha)}(1 + O(d^{-1})), && (42)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the second line follows from the equal bipartition assumption, the third line follows from Lemma 5 and Corollary 6, and the fourth line follows from Lemmas 2, 3 and some simple scaling analysis. Similarly, the asymptotic behavior of $\int \mathrm{d}U \left(\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}\right)^{s}$ is

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \left(\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}\right)^{s} = \mathrm{Cat}_{\alpha}^{s} d^{(1-\alpha)s}(1 + O(d^{-1})), \tag{43}$$

by Corollary 4. □

b. $s > 0$ entropies The calculations of $s > 0$ entropies (e.g. Tsallis) are straightforward, since the term $(\mathrm{tr}\{\rho^{\alpha}\})^{s}$ linearly appears in the definition. By Theorem 7, for positive integers α, s:

$$\int_{U(2^n)} \mathrm{d}U S^{(\alpha,s)}(\rho_{AC}) = \frac{1}{s(1-\alpha)} \left(\int_{U(2^n)} \mathrm{d}U (\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\})^{s} - 1 \right) = \frac{1 - \mathrm{Cat}_{\alpha}^{s} d^{(1-\alpha)s}(1 + O(d^{-1}))}{s(\alpha - 1)}. \tag{44}$$

Notice that the maximum value of $S^{(\alpha,s)}$ for a d-dimensional state is (when it is the maximally mixed state I/d)

$$S^{(\alpha,s)}(I/d) = \frac{1 - d^{(1-\alpha)s}}{s(\alpha - 1)}. \tag{45}$$

So we see a gap between the Haar-averaged and maximum value of $S^{(\alpha,s)}$:

$$\Delta S^{(\alpha,s)}(\text{Haar};\max) := S^{(\alpha,s)}(I/d) - \int \mathrm{d}U S^{(\alpha,s)}(\rho_{AC}) = \frac{\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha^s(1+O(d^{-1}))-1}{s(\alpha-1)} d^{(1-\alpha)s}, \quad (46)$$

which is vanishingly small in d.

As briefly mentioned, $s > 0$ entropies are not ideal for our study for several reasons, which we elaborate here:

1. The definitions of mutual information and tripartite information in terms of $s > 0$ entropies might not make much sense, since they are not even additive on product states. Recall that all partitions are in the maximally mixed state $I/\sqrt{d}$. However, the mutual information $\int \mathrm{d}U I^{(\alpha,s)}(A:C)$ is not directly given by $\Delta S^{(\alpha,s)}(\text{Haar};\max)$. Define

$$\Delta_0^{(\alpha,s)} := 2S^{(\alpha,s)}(I/\sqrt{d}) - S^{(\alpha,s)}(I/d) = \frac{1}{s(\alpha-1)}(1 - d^{(1-\alpha)s/2+1} + d^{(1-\alpha)s}). \quad (47)$$

   then

$$\int \mathrm{d}U I^{(\alpha,s)}(A:C) = 2S^{(\alpha,s)}(I/\sqrt{d}) - \int \mathrm{d}U S^{(\alpha,s)}(\rho_{AC}) = \Delta_0^{(\alpha,s)} + \Delta S^{(\alpha,s)}(\text{Haar};\max), \quad (48)$$

   which is dominated by the irrelevant $\Delta_0^{(\alpha,s)}$ ($\Delta S_T^{(\alpha)}(\text{Haar};\max)$ is vanishingly small).

2. The definition of entropic scrambling complexities and several other arguments rely on comparing generalized entropies of different orders α. But we can see from Eq. (45) that the maximally mixed values for $s > 0$ entropies vary with α, thus it also does not make much sense to do so.

3. Recall that the characteristic function for $s > 1$ entropies are concave (Tsallis is linear), in contrast to Rényi. Although Theorem 7 enables us to directly calculate the Haar-averaged $s > 1$ entanglement entropies, we cannot use Jensen's inequality to lower bound their design-averaged values.

Therefore, we are not going to devote much attention to $s > 0$ entropies in the rest of this work.

c. Rényi entropy Now we analyze the more interesting case of Rényi, the $s \to 0$ limit. Compared to $s > 0$ entropies, the calculations of Rényi are trickier because of the logarithm, which nevertheless leads to some nice features such as additivity and constant roof value. We are able to obtain the following result:

Theorem 8. *For equal partitions, in the large d limit,*

$$\int \mathrm{d}U S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC}) \geq \log d - O(1). \tag{49}$$

Proof. By definition,

$$\int \mathrm{d}U S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC}) = \int \mathrm{d}U f_R^{(\alpha)}(\mathrm{tr}\,\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\}), \tag{50}$$

where

$$f_R^{(\alpha)}(x) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log x \tag{51}$$

is the characteristic function for Rényi. Since

$$\frac{d^2 f_R^{(\alpha)}(x)}{dx^2} = \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\ln 2}\frac{1}{x^2} \geq 0 \tag{52}$$

when $\alpha > 1$, $f_R^{(\alpha)}(x)$ is convex. So

$$\int \mathrm{d}U S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC}) \geq f_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\,\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\}\right) \tag{53}$$

by Jensen's inequality. We note that this Jensen's lower bound due to convexity ($\mathbb{E}\, f_R \geq f_R\, \mathbb{E}$) will be repeatedly used to establish bounds for Rényi entropies. Then according to Eq. (37),

$$f_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\,\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\}\right) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\left(\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\,\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\}\right) \tag{54}$$

$$= \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\left(\mathrm{Cat}_{\alpha} d^{(1-\alpha)}(1+O(d^{-1}))\right) \tag{55}$$

$$= \log d - \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log \mathrm{Cat}_{\alpha} + O(d^{-1}). \tag{56}$$

Notice that Lemma 2 already guarantees that the leading correction term (the second term) is independent of d asymptotically. Further notice that $\log \mathrm{Cat}_{\alpha}$ is asymptotically linear in α, and satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log \mathrm{Cat}_{\alpha} \leq 2,\ \forall \alpha \geq 2, \tag{57}$$

so the second term does not grow with α as well. In summary, in the large n limit,

$$\int \mathrm{d}U S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC}) \geq f_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\,\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\}\right) = \log d - O(1). \tag{58}$$

□

So the gap between the Haar-averaged and maximum value of S_R (the "residual entropy") is

$$\Delta S_R^{(\alpha)}(\text{Haar};\max) := S_R^{(\alpha)}(I/d) - \int \mathrm{d}U S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC}) \leq O(1). \tag{59}$$

That is, the average Rényi entanglement entropies over the Haar measure is only bounded by a constant from the maximal. The result implies that a random unitary sampled from Haar typically has almost maximal Rényi entanglement entropies for all partitions: by Markov's inequality, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\Pr\left[S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC}) \leq \log d - \delta\right] \leq \frac{O(1)}{\delta}. \tag{60}$$

That is, the probability for $S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC})$ to be bounded away from the maximum is vanishingly small.

Now we consider the Rényi mutual information and tripartite information based on the entanglement entropy results. First, we can directly obtain

$$\int \mathrm{d}U I_R^{(\alpha)}(A:C) = \log d - \int \mathrm{d}U S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC}) \leq O(1), \tag{61}$$

which is equal to $\Delta S_R^{(\alpha)}(\text{Haar};\max)$ by additivity. The results holds similarly for AD. That is, the Rényi mutual information between any two local regions of the input and output is vanishingly small compared to the system size. On the other hand, for any partition size, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} I_R^{(\alpha)}(A:CD) &= S_R^{(\alpha)}(A) + S_R^{(\alpha)}(CD) - S_R^{(\alpha)}(ACD) && (62)\\ &= S_R^{(\alpha)}(A) + S_R^{(\alpha)}(CD) - S_R^{(\alpha)}(B) && (63)\\ &= \log d_A + \log d - \log d_B && (64)\\ &= 2\log d_A. && (65) \end{aligned}$$

Second line: the whole Choi state is pure so $S_R^{(\alpha)}(ACD) = S_R^{(\alpha)}(B)$; third line: the three partitions involved are maximally mixed; fourth line: $d_A d_B = d$. Under the equal partition assumption, $I_R^{(\alpha)}(A:CD) = \log d$. This is consistent with the fact that all information of A is kept in the whole output CD because of unitarity. As a result:

$$-I_{3R}^{(\alpha)}(A:C:D) \geq \log d - O(1), \tag{66}$$

by plugging in all relevant terms. So the Rényi tripartite information of Haar scrambling is indeed close to maximum. However, we would like to mention that the Rényi-α entropy is

not subadditive except for $\alpha = 1$, thus $-I_{3_R}^{(\alpha)}(A:C:D)$ is not necessarily nonnegative. A weaker form of subadditivity of Rényi entropies is given in Appendix B.

3. Finite dimensions

Here we prove some explicit bounds on the Haar-averaged trace, Rényi entropies, and in particular the min entropy, in the nonasymptotic regime. Detailed definitions and lemmas can be found in the Appendices. These results provide further quantitative evidence in finite dimensions that all entanglement entropies are typically almost maximal, and also help us derive further results such as nontrivial moments.

a. Trace and Rényi

Lemma 9. *Suppose* $q := \alpha^3/(32d_B^2) < 1$, *and* $d_A \le d_B$. *Then*

$$\sum_{\sigma\in S_\alpha} d_A^{\xi(\sigma\tau)} d_B^{\xi(\sigma)} \le h(q)\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A d_B^\alpha \le \frac{4^\alpha h(q)}{\sqrt{\pi}\alpha^{3/2}} d_A d_B^\alpha. \tag{67}$$

where $h(q) = 1 + 2q/[3(1-q)]$.

Proof. Define $c_{\delta,\alpha}$ as the number of permutations in S_α with genus δ, that is,

$$c_{\delta,\alpha} := |\{\sigma \in S_\alpha | \xi(\sigma) + \xi(\sigma\tau) = \alpha + 1 - 2\delta\}|. \tag{68}$$

Note that $c_{0,\alpha}$ is the Catalan number Cat_α by Lemma 3. Then

$$c_{\delta,\alpha} \le \frac{2}{3}\left(\frac{\alpha^3}{32}\right)^\delta \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha, \tag{69}$$

according to Lemma 37 in Appendix G. As a consequence of this inequality and the assumption $d_A \le d_B$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\sigma\in S_\alpha} d_A^{\xi(\sigma\tau)} d_B^{\xi(\sigma)} \le \sum_{\sigma\in S_\alpha} d_A d_B^{\xi(\sigma)+\xi(\sigma\tau)-1} = \sum_{\delta=0}^{(n-1)/2} c_{\delta,\alpha} d_A d_B^{\alpha-2\delta} = c_{0,\alpha} d_A d_B^\alpha \sum_{\delta=0}^{(n-1)/2} \frac{c_{\delta,\alpha}}{\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha} d_B^{-2\delta} \\
\le& c_{0,\alpha} d_A d_B^\alpha \left[1 + \frac{2}{3}\sum_{\delta=1}^{(n-1)/2}\left(\frac{\alpha^3}{32d_B^2}\right)^\delta\right] \le \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A d_B^\alpha \left[1 + \frac{2}{3}\sum_{\delta=1}^{\infty} q^\delta\right] = \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A d_B^\alpha \left[1 + \frac{2q}{3(1-q)}\right] \\
=& h(q)\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A d_B^\alpha \le \frac{4^\alpha h(q)}{\sqrt{\pi}\alpha^{3/2}} d_A d_B^\alpha.
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Here the last inequality follows from Lemma 27, which sets an upper bound on the Catalan numbers. □

Theorem 10. *Suppose $d > \sqrt{6}\alpha^{7/4}$. Then*

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\} \leq \frac{a_\alpha \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d^{1-\alpha}}{8}\left(1+\frac{2q}{3(1-q)}\right)\left(7+\cosh\frac{2\alpha(\alpha-1)}{d}\right), \tag{71}$$

$$\int \mathrm{d}U S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC}) \geq \log d - \frac{\log \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha}{\alpha-1} - \frac{\log\left[\frac{a_\alpha}{8}\left(1+\frac{2q}{3(1-q)}\right)\left(7+\cosh\frac{2\alpha(\alpha-1)}{d}\right)\right]}{\alpha-1}, \tag{72}$$

where $a_\alpha := \frac{1}{1-\frac{6\alpha^{7/2}}{d^2}}$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\sigma,\gamma\in S_\alpha} d^{[\xi(\sigma\tau)+\xi(\sigma)+\xi(\gamma\tau)+\xi(\gamma)]/2}\mathrm{Wg}(d,\sigma\gamma^{-1}) = \sum_{\zeta\in S_\alpha}\left[\sum_{\gamma\in S_\alpha} d^{[\xi(\zeta\gamma\tau)+\xi(\zeta\gamma)+\xi(\gamma\tau)+\xi(\gamma)]/2}\mathrm{Wg}(d,\zeta)\right] \\
\leq &\sum_{\zeta\in A_\alpha}\left[\sum_{\gamma\in S_\alpha} d^{[\xi(\zeta\gamma\tau)+\xi(\zeta\gamma)+\xi(\gamma\tau)+\xi(\gamma)]/2}\mathrm{Wg}(d,\zeta)\right] \leq \sum_{\zeta\in A_\alpha}\sum_{\gamma\in S_\alpha} d^{\xi(\gamma\tau)+\xi(\gamma)}\mathrm{Wg}(d,\zeta) \\
\leq &\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d^{\alpha+1}\left(1+\frac{2q}{3(1-q)}\right)\sum_{\zeta\in A_\alpha}\mathrm{Wg}(d,\zeta) \leq \frac{a_\alpha \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d}{8}\left(1+\frac{2q}{3(1-q)}\right)\left(7+\cosh\frac{2\alpha(\alpha-1)}{d}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where A_α is the set of even permutations, i.e. the alternating group. The first inequality follows from the fact that $\mathrm{Wg}(d,\zeta)$ is negative when ζ is an odd permutation; the second inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, note that $\sum_{\gamma\in S_\alpha} d^{\xi(\zeta\gamma\tau)+\xi(\zeta\gamma)} = \sum_{\gamma\in S_\alpha} d^{\xi(\gamma\tau)+\xi(\gamma)}$; the third inequality follows from Lemma 9, and the last inequality follows from Lemma 33. By plugging Eq. (73) into Eq. (30), we immediately obtain the trace result Eq. (71). The Rényi result Eq. (72) then follows from Jensen's inequality. □

We see that the leading terms indeed match the asymptotic results. The overall observation is similar: the Rényi entanglement entropies is very likely to be almost maximal, for large enough d.

For intuition, we compute $\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\}$ for $\alpha = 2, 3$ based on explicit formula for Weingarten functions, which also turn out to be useful later. When $\sigma \in S_2$,

$$\mathrm{Wg}(d,\sigma) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d^2-1} & \sigma = I, \\ -\frac{1}{d(d^2-1)} & \sigma = (1\ 2). \end{cases} \tag{74}$$

When $\sigma \in S_3$,

$$\mathrm{Wg}(d,\sigma) = \frac{1}{d(d^2-1)(d^2-4)}\begin{cases} d^2-2 & \sigma = I, \\ -d & \sigma = (1\ 2), \\ 2 & \sigma = (1\ 2\ 3). \end{cases} \tag{75}$$

Therefore,

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^2\} = \frac{2}{d+1} \leq \frac{2}{d}, \tag{76}$$

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^3\} = \frac{5d^3 - 7d^2 - 6d + 2}{d^2(d+1)(d^2-4)} \leq \frac{5}{d^2}. \tag{77}$$

b. Min entropy The results so far only directly apply to positive integers α. The min entanglement entropy, which corresponds to the special limit $\alpha \to \infty$, plays crucial roles in the discussions of scrambling complexities. Now we examine the min entanglement entropy. In particular.

Theorem 11.

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \|\rho_{AC}\| \leq \frac{m_d}{d}, \tag{78}$$

$$\int \mathrm{d}U S_{\min}(\rho_{AC}) \geq \log d - \log m_d. \tag{79}$$

where $m_d := \min\{7,\ 4(8\sqrt{d})^{1/\sqrt{d}}\}$.

Proof. Suppose $d \leq 70$. Then we numerically obtain that

$$d \int \mathrm{d}U \|\rho_{AC}\| \leq d \left(\int \mathrm{d}U \, \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^3\} \right)^{1/3} \leq d \left(\frac{5d^3 - 7d^2 - 6d + 2}{d^2(d+1)(d^2-4)} \right)^{1/3} \leq 7. \tag{80}$$

Now suppose $d \geq 50$. Let $\alpha = \lceil \sqrt{d}/2 \rceil$. Then

$$\frac{6\alpha^{7/2}}{d^2} \leq \frac{2}{5}, \quad q = \frac{\alpha^3}{32d^2} \leq \frac{1}{210}, \quad \frac{2\alpha(\alpha-1)}{d} \leq \frac{2}{3}, \tag{81}$$

so that

$$a_\alpha \leq \frac{5}{3}, \quad h(q) \leq \frac{301}{300}, \quad \frac{1}{8}\left(7 + \cosh \frac{2\alpha(\alpha-1)}{d}\right) \leq \frac{103}{100}. \tag{82}$$

Consequently,

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \, \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\} \leq \left[\frac{a_\alpha}{8\sqrt{\pi}} \left(1 + \frac{2q}{3(1-q)}\right) \left(7 + \cosh \frac{2\alpha(\alpha-1)}{d}\right) \right] \frac{4^\alpha d^{1-\alpha}}{\alpha^{3/2}} \leq \frac{4^\alpha d^{1-\alpha}}{\alpha^{3/2}}, \tag{83}$$

and thus

$$d \int \mathrm{d}U \|\rho_{AC}\| \leq d \left(\int \mathrm{d}U \, \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\} \right)^{1/\alpha} \leq 4\Big(\frac{d}{\alpha^{3/2}}\Big)^{1/\alpha} \leq 4\Big(\frac{d}{(\sqrt{d}/2)^{3/2}}\Big)^{2/\sqrt{d}} = 4(8\sqrt{d})^{1/\sqrt{d}}. \tag{84}$$

The proof of Eq. (78) is completed by observing that $4(8\sqrt{d})^{1/\sqrt{d}} > 7$ when $50 \leq d \leq 52$ and $4(8\sqrt{d})^{1/\sqrt{d}} < 7$ when $53 \leq d \leq 70$. Eq. (79) then follows from the convexity of $-\log$. We note that slightly lower m_d can in principle be obtained by computing to higher orders in Eq. (81), which is nevertheless not important for the main idea. □

As d gets large, m_d approaches the limit 4, and $\log m_d$ approaches the limit 2. As an implication of Lemma 26, Theorem 11 with d replaced by d_{AC} also holds when the four subregions have different dimensions, as long as $d_A, d_C \leq \sqrt{d}$ and $d_{AC} \leq d$. The same remark also applies to Theorem 15 below.

D. Unitary designs and their approximates

1. *Average over unitary designs*

Now we state a key observation: the Haar integral of $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\}$, the defining term of α entropies, only uses the first α moments of the full Haar measure. Equivalently, pseudorandom unitary α-designs are already indistinguishable from completely random by $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\}$. More explicitly, let ν_α be an α-design ensemble. Then we have

$$\int \mathrm{d}U U_{i_1 j_1} \cdots U_{i_\alpha j_\alpha} U^*_{i'_1 j'_1} \cdots U^*_{i'_\alpha j'_\alpha} = \mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha} \left[U_{i_1 j_1} \cdots U_{i_\alpha j_\alpha} U^*_{i'_1 j'_1} \cdots U^*_{i'_\alpha j'_\alpha} \right] \tag{85}$$

by definition. Therefore, all Haar integrals of $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\}$ from the last part (Eqs. (34) and (37)) directly carry over to α-designs.

This observation implies that α entropies can generically diagnose whether a scrambler is locally indistinguishable from random dynamics as powerful as α-designs. The Haar-averaged Tsallis-α entropies ($s = 1$) are exactly saturated by α-designs since Tsallis entropy is linear in $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho^\alpha\}$. However, as mentioned, we cannot make analogous arguments for $s > 1$: the exact saturation requires f_s and the Haar integral to commute asymptotically, which is not known to hold; and the above Jensen's bound does not apply since $f_{s>1}$ becomes concave. In contrast, the Rényi entropies can be lower bounded because of convexity. Due to the importance of Rényi entropies, we state the results as a theorem:

Theorem 12.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha} \left[S_R^{(\alpha)} (\rho_{AC}) \right] \geq f_R^{(\alpha)} \left(\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr} \left\{ \rho_{AC}^\alpha \right\} \right) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr} \left\{ \rho_{AC}^\alpha \right\} \right). \tag{86}$$

In particular, in the large d limit,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha} \left[S_R^{(\alpha)} (\rho_{AC}) \right] \geq \log d - O(1). \tag{87}$$

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha}\left[S_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\rho_{AC}\right)\right]=\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha}\left[f_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\right\}\right)\right]\geq f_R^{(\alpha)}(\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha}[\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\}])=f_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\int \mathrm{d}U\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\right\}\right), \tag{88}$$

where the inequality follows from Jensen, and the last equality follows from the fact that ν_α is an α-design. By plugging in Eq. (42), we directly obtain the asymptotic result. □

The theorem enables us to use the Haar integrals of traces to lower bound the design-averaged Rényi entanglement entropies in all dimensions. Asymptotically, the $O(1)$ upper bound on the residual Rényi-α entropy still holds. So we can conclude that Tsallis and Rényi-α entanglement entropies are very likely to be almost maximal when sampling from unitary α-designs, as well as Haar. The min entanglement entropy of designs will be explicitly analyzed later.

2. Error analysis: approximate unitary designs

For rigorousness, we need to analyze the robustness/sensitivity of the entropic properties of designs. Indeed, one also expects ensembles that well approximate α-designs to have close-to-Haar α entropies. The error analysis will be useful for e.g. relating scrambling complexities to circuit depth. Here we relate typical approximation measures of designs to Rényi entropies.

First, the canonical definition of designs by polynomials leads to the following direct measure of distance to designs:

Definition 8 (m-approximate unitary designs [48])**.** Ensemble ν is an ϵ-m-approximate unitary t-design ("m" represents monomial) if

$$\left|\int \mathrm{d}U q^{(k)}(U)-\mathbb{E}_\nu\left[q^{(k)}(U)\right]\right|\leq\epsilon,\quad\forall q^{(k)},k\leq t. \tag{89}$$

where $q^{(k)}(U)=U_{i_1j_1}\cdots U_{i_kj_k}U^*_{m_1n_1}\cdots U^*_{m_kn_k}$ is a monomial of degree k both in the entries of U and in their complex conjugates.

Note that the bound is on each monomial with unit constant factor, otherwise the difference can be arbitrarily amplified by including more terms or change the constant.

Theorem 13. *Let ω_α be an ϵ-m-approximate unitary α-design. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}[\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}] \leq \int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\} + d^{\alpha}\epsilon, \tag{90}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}\left[S_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\rho_{AC}\right)\right] \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\left(\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\} + d^{\alpha}\epsilon\right) \tag{91}$$

In the large d limit,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}[S_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\rho_{AC}\right)] \geq \log d - O(1) - \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha \ln 2} d^{2\alpha-1}\epsilon\left(1+O\left(d^{-1}\right)\right). \tag{92}$$

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}[\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}] - \int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\} \leq \left|\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\} - \mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}[\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}]\right| \leq \frac{1}{d^{\alpha}} d^{2\alpha}\epsilon = d^{\alpha}\epsilon \tag{93}$$

by triangle inequality, since $\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}$ is the sum of $d^{2\alpha}$ monomials according to Eq. (24). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}\left[S_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\rho_{AC}\right)\right] \geq f_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}\left[\mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}\right]\right) \\
=&\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log \mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}[\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\}] \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\left(\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\} + d^{\alpha}\epsilon\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

where the first inequality follows from Jensen, and the second inequality follows from Eq. (93) and that $-\log$ is monotone decreasing. We can then use the $\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}$ results to analyze the perturbation. Most importantly, in the large d limit,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\left(\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\} + d^{\alpha}\epsilon\right) - \mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}\left[S_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\rho_{AC}\right)\right] = -\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\left(1+\frac{d^{\alpha}\epsilon}{\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\left\{\rho_{AC}^{\alpha}\right\}}\right) \\
\leq&\frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log\left(1+\frac{1}{\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha} d^{2\alpha-1}\epsilon\left(1+O\left(d^{-1}\right)\right)\right) \leq \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha \ln 2} d^{2\alpha-1}\epsilon\left(1+O\left(d^{-1}\right)\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

where the first inequality follows from Eq. (42) and the following analysis, and the second inequality follows from a logarithm inequality $\ln(1+x) \leq x$ when $x > -1$. So we conclude that the error in $S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC})$ at most scales as $O(d^{2\alpha-1}\epsilon)$. □

Recall the other definition of exact designs by frame operators. The deviation of an ensemble from a unitary t-design can also be quantified by a suitable norm of the deviation operator

$$\Delta_t(\nu) := \mathcal{F}_t(\nu) - \mathcal{F}_t(\mathrm{U}(d)). \tag{96}$$

The operator norm and trace norm of $\Delta_t(\nu)$ are two common figures of merit. The latter choice is more convenient for the current study:

Definition 9 (FO-approximate unitary designs)**.** Ensemble ν is a λ-FO-approximate unitary t-design (FO represents frame operator) if

$$\|\Delta_t(\nu)\|_1 \leq \lambda. \tag{97}$$

We note that this definition is very similar to the quantum tensor product expander (TPE) [49]. TPEs conventionally use the operator norm, and the deviation operators relate to each other by partial transposes (like operators X, Y in Eqs. (26,27)).

Here we can directly use the operator form of local density operators derived earlier to do an error analysis of FO-approximate designs. Let ω_α be a λ-FO-approximate unitary α-design. We define $\tilde{\Delta}_\alpha$, and explicit write out Δ_α:

$$\tilde{\Delta}_\alpha(\omega_\alpha) = \mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}[(U \otimes U^\dagger)^{\otimes\alpha}] - \int \mathrm{d}U (U \otimes U^\dagger)^{\otimes\alpha}, \tag{98}$$

$$\Delta_\alpha(\omega_\alpha) = \mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}[U^{\otimes\alpha} \otimes U^{\dagger\otimes\alpha}] - \int \mathrm{d}U U^{\otimes\alpha} \otimes U^{\dagger\otimes\alpha}. \tag{99}$$

Theorem 14. *Let ω_α be a λ-FO-approximate unitary α-design. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}[\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\}] \leq \int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\} + \frac{1}{d^\alpha}\lambda, \tag{100}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}[S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AC})] \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\left(\int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\} + \frac{1}{d^\alpha}\lambda\right). \tag{101}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha}[\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\}] - \int \mathrm{d}U \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\} = \frac{1}{d^\alpha}\mathrm{tr}\{\tilde{\Delta}_\alpha(\omega_\alpha)Y_\alpha\} \leq \frac{1}{d^\alpha}\left\|\tilde{\Delta}_\alpha(\omega_\alpha)\right\|_1 \|Y_\alpha\| \\
=&\frac{1}{d^\alpha}\left\|\tilde{\Delta}_\alpha(\omega_\alpha)\right\|_1 = \frac{1}{d^\alpha}\|\Delta_\alpha(\omega_\alpha)\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{d^\alpha}\lambda,
\end{aligned} \tag{102}$$

where the first inequality follows from Hölder's inequality, and the second line follows from the unitarity of Y. □

We note that the essential difference between the different definitions of approximate designs is just in the norm used to measure the distance [25]. Letting $\epsilon, \lambda = 0$ recovers equivalent definitions of exact designs.

E. Hierarchy of entropic scrambling complexities

1. *Complexities by Rényi entanglement entropy*

As motivated in the introduction, we expect that there is a hierarchy of scrambling complexities that lie in between information scramblers and Haar-random unitaries, with

different levels of the hierarchy indexed by the order of design needed to mimic the scrambler. Then our results of design-averaged Rényi entanglement entropies imply that we can use the generic maximality of Rényi-α entanglement entropy as i) a necessary indicator of the resemblance to an α-design, and ii) a diagnostic of the scrambling complexity of an α-design, or α-scrambling. For example, if a supposedly random unitary dynamics does not produce nearly maximal Rényi-α entanglement entropy in all valid partitions, as α-designs must do, then it is simply not close to any α-design. The maximality of Rényi entanglement entropies may not be relevant for probing designs at the global level, but it can probe the typical behaviors of entanglement between local regions which mimic designs. Recall that Rényi entropy is monotone nonincreasing in the order, and all orders share the same roof value. So α-scrambling necessarily implies α'-scrambling, for $\alpha \geq \alpha'$.

2. *Extreme orders: 1- and ∞-scrambling*

Here we consider $\alpha = 1, \infty$ more carefully, since the corresponding Rényi entropies are defined only by taking a limit, and they respectively correspond to the weakest and strongest entropic scrambling complexities.

Recall that $\alpha \to 1$ gives the von Neumann entropy, which probes information/Page scrambling. First notice that 1-designs do not necessarily scramble quantum information. For example, the ensemble of tensor product of Pauli operators acting on each qubit

$$\{P_1 \otimes P_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes P_n\}, \quad P = I, \sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z \tag{103}$$

forms a 1-design [16]. However, this Pauli ensemble clearly does not scramble since it cannot create interaction/entanglement among qubits (so local operators do not grow). So any entanglement entropy will be zero. On the other hand, 2-designs are sufficient to maximize Rényi-2 entropies, which lower bounds the corresponding von Neumann entropies. It is shown in [40] that there actually exists an arbitrarily large gap between them. So one can also say that information scrambling is strictly weaker than 2-scrambling. Therefore, the minimal information scrambling corresponds to a scrambling complexity in between 1- and 2-designs.

Another special case is $\alpha \to \infty$, which leads to the min entropy $S_{\min}(\rho) = -\log \|\rho\| = -\log \lambda_{\max}(\rho)$. Almost maximal min entanglement entropy directly indicates that the spec-

trum of the reduced density operators (the entanglement spectrum) is almost uniform. As the example of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ (in Section II A) shows, the min entropy is extremely sensitive to even one single peak in the entanglement spectrum, since it only cares about the largest eigenvalue. So it is in a sense the "harshest" entropy measure. The min entanglement entropy is then the strongest entropic diagnostic of scrambling: if it is always almost maximal, then the entanglement spectrum cannot accommodate any peak, and we simply cannot distinguish the scrambler from completely random by looking at the spectrum of any reduced density matrix alone. We call this situation max scrambling. We shall arrive at formal arguments that designs are distinguishable from Haar only up to a finite order (in both the random unitaries and random states settings) for finite dimensions, by studying the min entanglement entropy.

3. Nontrivial moments

Given the definition of max scrambling by the min entropy, one may wonder if the full Haar measure is required to achieve this strongest form of entropic scrambling. Here we answer this question in the negative: for a given dimension, only finite number of moments (which scales logarithmically in the dimension) are needed, which we call nontrivial moments.

From the proof of Theorem 11, we can directly see that the same result holds if the average is taken over an α-design with $\alpha \geq \lceil \sqrt{d}/2 \rceil$. The conclusion is clear from the proof when $d \geq 50$. When $17 \leq d \leq 49$, $\lceil \sqrt{d}/2 \rceil \geq 3$, so the conclusion also follows from the proof. The conclusion is obvious when $d \leq 7$. It remains to consider the case $8 \leq d \leq 16$, which means $\lceil \sqrt{d}/2 \rceil = 2$. Therefore, Eq. (76) applies, so that

$$d \int \mathrm{d}U \|\rho_{AC}\| \leq d \left(\int \mathrm{d}U \, \mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^2\} \right)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{2d} < 7. \tag{104}$$

Therefore, Eqs. (78) and (79) still hold if the average is taken over an α-design with $\alpha \geq \lceil \sqrt{d}/2 \rceil$.

We can further show that, in fact, $O(\log d)$-design is sufficient to achieve nearly maximal min entropy:

Theorem 15. *Let ν_α be a unitary α-design, where $1 \leq \alpha = \lceil \log d/a \rceil \leq \sqrt{d}/2$ and $a > 0$;*

then

$$d\,\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha}\|\rho_{AC}\| \le 2^{2+a}, \tag{105}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha} S_{\min}(\rho_{AC}) \ge \log d - 2 - a. \tag{106}$$

In particular, if $\alpha \ge \lceil \log d \rceil$*, then*

$$d\,\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha}\|\rho_{AC}\| \le 8, \tag{107}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha} S_{\min}(\rho_{AC}) \ge \log d - 3. \tag{108}$$

Proof. If $1 \le \alpha = \lceil \log d/a \rceil \le \sqrt{d}/2$, then one can show that Eq. (83) holds as in the proof of Theorem 11 even without additional restrictions. Therefore,

$$d\,\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha}\|\rho_{AC}\| \le d\left(\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha}[\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_{AC}^\alpha\}]\right)^{1/\alpha} \le 4\left(\frac{d}{\alpha^{3/2}}\right)^{1/\alpha} \le 4d^{1/\alpha} \le 4d^{a/\log d} = 2^{2+a}, \tag{109}$$

which confirms Eq. (105) and implies Eq. (106).

Now suppose $\alpha = \lceil \log d \rceil$. If $\alpha \ge \lceil \sqrt{d}/2 \rceil$, then an α-design is also a $\lceil \sqrt{d}/2 \rceil$-design, so (107) and (108) hold according to Theorem 11. Otherwise, $\alpha \le \sqrt{d}/2$, and the two equations follow from (105) and (106) with $a = 1$. The same conclusion also holds when $\alpha \ge \lceil \log d \rceil$. □

4. On the gaps between complexities

A further question then arises as to whether the entropic scrambling complexities form a strict hierarchy, i.e., whether different complexities are gapped. Of course, by the nontrivial moments result just presented, we already know that $\alpha > O(\log d)$ complexities are not well separated.

A straightforward definition of a separation between α- and α'-scrambling ($\alpha' < \alpha$) is the following: There exist scramblers such that the associated Rényi-α' entropies are always near maximal, but some Rényi-α entropies can be bounded away from maximal. Such separations are in principle possible according to the properties of Rényi entropies.

We tried several approaches to establish general separations in the Choi model, with limited success. In particular, we attempted to generalize the partially scrambling unitary model [40], and attempted to extend the gap results in the random state setting (next section) to random unitaries. The partially scrambling unitary model is used in [40] to

prove a large separation between von Neumann and Rényi-2 tripartite information in the Choi state setting. By contrast, as we analyze in Appendix H, this model is not likely to provide similar separations among generalized entropies. The analysis nevertheless reveals a rather interesting tradeoff between sensitivity and robustness between Rényi and $s > 0$ entropies. However, we are able to establish gaps using projective designs in the random state setting (see next section), but the results cannot be directly generalized to unitary designs at the moment. The reasons will be explained in more detail later. We leave the gap problem in the Choi model open.

5. Relating to other complexities

Via certain models of random dynamics, we can relate entropic scrambling complexities to traditional complexities such as time and circuit depth. For example, it is shown in [23, 24] that $O(\alpha^9 n[\alpha n + \log(1/\epsilon)])$ Haar-random local gates are sufficient to form an ϵ-approximate α-design of n qubits. By the error analysis result, one can easily see that the minimum number of gates/circuit depth needed to maximize Rényi-α entropies scales polynomially in α and n: Let $\epsilon = 2^{-3\alpha n}$ so that $\log(1/\epsilon) = 3\alpha n$, then the number of gates scales as $O(\alpha^{10} n^2)$, but meanwhile the error term in Eq. (95) is vanishingly small, which indicates that such circuit is a good α-scrambler. That is, the scrambling complexity and the random circuit complexity (minimum number of gates) can be polynomially related. We note that the $O(\alpha^{10} n^2)$ scaling can be improved to $O(\alpha n^2)$ for $\alpha = o(\sqrt{n})$ by a recent result [25].

From a more physical point of view, one may be interested in the minimum time it takes for a physical scrambler, say, a Hamiltonian evolution of a quantum many-body system, to achieve certain scrambling complexities, which generalizes the fast scrambling conjecture. Ref. [25] introduces the notion of design Hamiltonian, and conjectures that the shortest time for local time-independent Hamiltonians to achieve approximate α-designs scales roughly as $O(\alpha \log n)$ with unknown dependence in ϵ. Note that the error dependence will be crucial in translating it to the language of scrambling complexities: an $\omega(\log\log(1/\epsilon))$ dependence is sufficient to dominate $\log n$. Suppose we conjecture that the minimum α-scrambling time scales roughly as $O(\alpha \log n)$ as well. Then based on the nontrivial moment result:

Conjecture 1 (Fast max scrambling conjecture)**.** The minimum time for a physical system to max-scramble scales as $\tilde{O}(n)$.

The max scrambling conjecture contrasts with the minimum Page scrambling time of $O(\log n)$.

IV. GENERALIZED ENTROPIES AND RANDOM STATES

The previous section focused on Choi states, which encodes the intrinsic properties of corresponding unitary channels. We showed that random unitaries of different degrees are associated with near-maximal generalized entanglement entropies of the corresponding orders. Here we consider a more straightforward problem—entanglement entropy of random states—to strengthen the connections between generalized entropies and designs. In this setting, we obtain analogous main results that designs maximize corresponding Rényi entanglement entropies, and that there are logarithmic nontrivial moments. We are also able to obtain solid results on the gap problem. We shall follow similar steps as in the random unitary setting but be more concise.

The original problem and related results have been playing central roles in the study of e.g. black holes and quantum information theory for a long time. The famous Page's theorem roughly says that the average entropy of small subsystems of a bipartite state is nearly maximal; or in other words, a randomly sampled state is very likely to be maximally entangled. Similar observations were even earlier made by Lubkin [50] and Lloyd and Pagels [51]. In particular, [51] derived the distribution of the local eigenvalues of a random state, which may imply this result. Also see e.g. [52, 53] for further studies of this phenomenon.

A. Haar-random states

Consider a bipartite system with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, where $\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B$ have dimensions d_A, d_B, respectively, assuming $d_A \leq d_B$. We use $\mathbb{E}$ to denote the average over states drawn uniformly from the unit sphere in $\mathcal{H}$. The Page conjecture [21], proved in [54–56], states that the average entanglement entropy of each reduced state is given by

$$\mathbb{E}\, S(\rho_A) = \mathbb{E}\, S(\rho_B) = \frac{1}{\ln 2}\left(\sum_{j=d_B+1}^{d_A d_B} - \frac{d_A - 1}{2d_B}\right) > \log d_A - \frac{1}{2\ln 2}\frac{d_A}{d_B} \geq \log d_A - \frac{1}{2\ln 2}. \quad (110)$$

The gap between the average entropy and the maximum $\log d_A$ is bounded by the dimension-independent constant $\frac{1}{2\ln 2}$. In this section we shall strengthen this result by proving the gap

between the average Rényi α-entropy of each reduced state and the maximum $\log d_A$ is also bounded by a constant that is independent of the dimensions d_A, d_B and the parameter α.

Suppose $|\psi\rangle$ is drawn uniformly from the unit sphere in $\mathcal{H}$. To establish a lower bound for the average Rényi α-entropy, we shall derive an analytical formula for the average of the α-moment $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\}$, where ρ_A is the reduced state of $|\psi\rangle$ for system A. Expand $|\psi\rangle$ in the standard product basis $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{jk} \psi_{jk}|jk\rangle$, where $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d_A$ label the basis elements for $\mathcal{H}_A$, and $k = 1, 2, \ldots, d_B$ label the basis elements for $\mathcal{H}_B$. Then

$$\rho_A = \sum_{j_1, j_2, k} \psi_{j_1 k} \psi^*_{j_2, k} |j_1\rangle\langle j_2|. \tag{111}$$

The general result of the Haar-averaged trace is:

Theorem 16.

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} = \frac{1}{\alpha! D_{[\alpha]}} \sum_{\sigma \in S_\alpha} d_A^{\xi(\sigma\tau)} d_B^{\xi(\sigma)}, \tag{112}$$

where

$$D_{[\alpha]} = \binom{d_A d_B + \alpha - 1}{\alpha} = \frac{d_A d_B (d_A d_B + 1) \cdots (d_A d_B + \alpha - 1)}{\alpha!} \tag{113}$$

is the dimension of the symmetric subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes \alpha}$.

Proof. By Eq. (111),

$$\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} = \sum_{\text{all indices}} \psi_{j_1,k_1} \psi^*_{j_2,k_1} \psi_{j_2,k_2} \psi^*_{j_3,k_2} \cdots \psi_{j_\alpha,k_\alpha} \psi^*_{j_1,k_\alpha} = \mathrm{tr}\left[(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)^\alpha Q_\alpha\right], \tag{114}$$

where

$$Q_\alpha = \sum_{\text{all indices}} |j_2 k_1\rangle\langle j_1 k_1| \otimes |j_3 k_2\rangle\langle j_2 k_2| \otimes \cdots \otimes |j_1 k_\alpha\rangle\langle j_\alpha k_\alpha|. \tag{115}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} = \frac{1}{D_{[\alpha]}} \mathrm{tr}\{P_{[\alpha]} Q_\alpha\}, \tag{116}$$

where $P_{[\alpha]}$ is the projector onto the symmetric subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes \alpha}$, and $D_{[\alpha]}$ is its dimension. Recall that the symmetric group S_α acts on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes \alpha}$ by permuting the tensor factors, and $P_{[\alpha]}$ can be expressed as follows

$$P_{[\alpha]} = \frac{1}{\alpha!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_\alpha} U_\sigma, \tag{117}$$

where U_σ is the unitary operator associated with the permutation σ. Simple analysis shows that

$$\mathrm{tr}\{U_\sigma Q_\alpha\} = d_A^{\xi(\sigma\tau)} d_B^{\xi(\sigma)}. \tag{118}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} = \frac{1}{\alpha! D_{[\alpha]}} \sum_{\sigma\in S_\alpha} d_A^{\xi(\sigma\tau)} d_B^{\xi(\sigma)}. \tag{119}$$

□

We noticed that similar results have been derived and rederived several times [50, 57–59]. Compared to known approaches, our approach seems simpler; in addition, it admits easy generalization to states drawn from (approximate) complex projective designs, which is not obvious for other approaches we are aware of.

To get an intuitive understanding of Eq. (112), it is worth taking a closer look at several concrete examples. When $\alpha = 2$, we reproduce a formula derived by Lubkin [50]:

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^2\} = \frac{d_A + d_B}{d_A d_B + 1}, \tag{120}$$

From this equation we can derive a nearly-tight lower bound for the average Rényi 2-entropy,

$$\mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(2)}(\rho_A) \geq \log \frac{d_A d_B + 1}{d_A + d_B} > \log d_A - \log \frac{d_A + d_B}{d_B} \geq \log d_A - 1. \tag{121}$$

When $d_A = d_B$, the averages of the first few moments are given by

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^2\} = \frac{2d_A}{d_A^2 + 1} \leq \frac{2}{d_A}, \tag{122}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^3\} = \frac{5d_A^2 + 1}{(d_A^2 + 1)(d_A^2 + 2)} \leq \frac{5}{d_A^2}, \tag{123}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^4\} = \frac{14d_A^3 + 10d_A}{(d_A^2 + 1)(d_A^2 + 2)(d_A^2 + 3)} \leq \frac{14}{d_A^3}, \tag{124}$$

which imply that

$$\mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(2)}(\rho_A) \geq \log d_A - 1, \tag{125}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(3)}(\rho_A) \geq \log d_A - \frac{\log 5}{2}, \tag{126}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(4)}(\rho_A) \geq \log d_A - \frac{\log 14}{3}. \tag{127}$$

Note that the gap of each Rényi entropy from the maximum is tied with the corresponding Catalan number. This is not a coincidence.

When $d_A = d_B$ is large ($d_A, d_B \gg \alpha$), the formula for $\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\}$ can be simplified:

Theorem 17.

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} = \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A^{-\alpha+1} + O\Big(d_A^{-(\alpha+1)}\Big). \tag{128}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \geq \log d_A - \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha - 1} + O(d_A^{-2}). \tag{129}$$

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} = \frac{1}{\alpha! D_{[\alpha]}} \sum_{\sigma\in S_\alpha} d_A^{\xi(\sigma\tau)+\xi(\sigma)} = \frac{\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A^{\alpha+1} + O(d_A^{\alpha-1})}{d_A^{2\alpha} + O(d_A^{2\alpha-2})} = \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A^{-\alpha+1} + O\Big(d_A^{-(\alpha+1)}\Big). \tag{130}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \geq \frac{\log \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d^{-\alpha+1}}{1-\alpha} + O(d_A^{-2}) = \log d_A - \frac{\log \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha}{\alpha-1} + O(d_A^{-2}) \geq \log d_A - \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha-1} + O(d_A^{-2}). \tag{131}$$

□

This equation suggests that the gap between the average Rényi α-entropy and the maximum $\log d_A$ is bounded by a constant when $d_A = d_B$ is sufficiently large. It turns out that this conclusion actually holds without restrictions on d_A, d_B:

Lemma 18. *Let $q := \alpha^3/(32 d_B^2) < 1, h(q) := 1 + 2q/[3(1-q)]$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} \leq h(q)\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A^{1-\alpha} \leq \frac{4^\alpha h(q)}{\sqrt{\pi}\alpha^{3/2}} d_A^{1-\alpha}, \tag{132}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \geq \log d_A - \frac{2\alpha - \frac{3}{2}\log\alpha + \log h(q) - \frac{1}{2}\log\pi}{\alpha-1}. \tag{133}$$

Proof. According to Lemma 9,

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} = \frac{1}{\alpha! D_{[\alpha]}} \sum_{\sigma\in S_\alpha} d_A^{\xi(\sigma\tau)} d_B^{\xi(\sigma)} \leq \frac{h(q)\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A d_B^\alpha}{d_A^\alpha d_B^\alpha} \leq h(q)\mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A^{1-\alpha} \leq \frac{4^\alpha h(q)}{\sqrt{\pi}\alpha^{3/2}} d_A^{1-\alpha}, \tag{134}$$

which in turn implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log\frac{4^\alpha h(q)}{\sqrt{\pi}\alpha^{3/2}} d_A^{1-\alpha}, \tag{135}$$

$$= \log d_A - \frac{2\alpha - \frac{3}{2}\log\alpha + \log h(q) - \frac{1}{2}\log\pi}{\alpha-1}. \tag{136}$$

□

Theorem 19.

$$\mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \geq \log d_A - 2 \quad \forall d_A \leq d_B, 0 \leq \alpha \leq \infty. \tag{137}$$

Proof. Recall that Rényi α-entropy is nonincreasing with α, so to establish the theorem, it suffices to prove the lower bound for the min entropy, which corresponds to the limit $\alpha \to \infty$. Then

$$S_{\min}(\rho_A) = -\,\mathbb{E}\log\|\rho_A\| \geq -\log\mathbb{E}\,\|\rho_A\| \geq -\log(4d_A^{-1}) = \log d_A - 2. \tag{138}$$

Here the second inequality follows from Lemma 20 below. □

Lemma 20.

$$(\mathbb{E}\,\|\rho_A\|^\alpha)^{1/\alpha} \le 4d_A^{-1} \quad \forall 0 < \alpha \le \lfloor (29d_B^2)^{1/3} \rfloor. \tag{139}$$

Proof. The conclusion is obvious when $d_A \le 4$. When $d_B \ge d_A \ge 5$, note that $(\mathbb{E}\,\|\rho_A\|^\alpha)^{1/\alpha}$ is nondecreasing with α for $\alpha > 0$, so it suffices to prove the lemma in the case $\alpha = \lfloor 29d_B^{2/3} \rfloor$. Then $\alpha^{3/2} \ge d_B \ge d_A$ and $0.6 < q = \alpha^3/(32d_B^2) \le 29/32$. According to Lemma 18,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\,\|\rho_A\|^\alpha \le \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} &\le \frac{4^\alpha h(q)}{\sqrt{\pi}\alpha^{3/2}} d_A^{1-\alpha} = \left[\frac{d_A}{\sqrt{32\pi q} d_B}\left(1 + \frac{2q}{3(1-q)}\right)\right] 4^\alpha d_A^{-\alpha} \\ &\le \frac{3-q}{3(1-q)\sqrt{32\pi q}} 4^\alpha d_A^{-\alpha} \le 4^\alpha d_A^{-\alpha}, \end{aligned} \tag{140}$$

which implies the lemma. Here the last inequality follows from the observation that $f(q) := (3-q)/[3(1-q)\sqrt{32\pi q}] < 1$ for $0.6 < q \le 29/32$. This fact can be verified immediately if we notice that the derivative $f'(q)$ has a unique zero at $q_0 = 4 - \sqrt{13}$ in the interval $0 < q < 1$ and that $f(q)$ is monotonically decreasing for $0 < q < q_0$ and monotonically increasing for $q_0 < q < 1$. □

When $d_B > d_A$, Theorem 19 can be improved as follows:

Theorem 21. *For all $d_A \le d_B, 0 \le \alpha \le \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \ge \log d_A - 2\log\left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{d_A}{d_B}}\right) - \log c \ge \log d_A - 2\sqrt{\frac{d_A}{d_B}} - \log c, \tag{141}$$

where $c = 1$ if $\mathcal{H}$ is real and $c = 2$ if $\mathcal{H}$ is complex.

This theorem follows from Lemma 22 below. We believe that the constant c in Theorem 21 and Lemma 22 can be set to one in both real and complex cases. We note that Hayden and Winter had a similar result [60], but they are not so explicit about the constant and the dimensions for which their result is applicable.

The following lemma is proved in Appendix C.

Lemma 22.

$$\mathbb{E}\,\sqrt{\|\rho_A\|} \le \sqrt{c}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_A}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_B}}\right), \tag{142}$$

where $c = 1$ if $\mathcal{H}$ is real and $c = 2$ if $\mathcal{H}$ is complex.

B. Projective designs

1. Tight Page's theorem

Recall Page's theorem, which states that Haar-averaged von Neumann entanglement entropies of small subsystems are nearly maximal. This theorem is not tight from the perspectives of both entropy and randomness: the Haar-averaged higher Rényi entanglement entropies are generically close to maximum as well, and the complete randomness is an overkill to maximize the entanglement entropies. Our results imply that Page's theorem can be strengthend from both sides. Similar to the random unitary setting, since $\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\}$ only uses α moments of the Haar measure, all bounds on $\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\}$ and $\mathbb{E}\,S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A)$ from the last part still hold if the average is over α-designs. So we have a tight Page's theorem for each order α:

Theorem 23 (Tight Page's theorem)**.** *Let ν_α be an α-design. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} = \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\}, \tag{143}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha}\,S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \geq f_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\}\right) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\log \mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\}, \tag{144}$$

In particular, when $d_A = d_B$ is large,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_\alpha}\,S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \geq \log d_A - \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha-1} + O(d_A^{-2}). \tag{145}$$

2. Approximate designs and entropic design complexities

Here we show that the average Rényi α-entanglement entropy of quantum states drawn from an approximate α-design with sufficient accuracy is also close to the maximum. A concrete example is provided based on typical Clifford orbits.

Given an ensemble ν of quantum states, define

$$\Delta_\alpha(\nu) := D_{[\alpha]}\,\mathbb{E}_\nu(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)^{\otimes t} - P_{[\alpha]}. \tag{146}$$

Definition 10 (Approximate designs)**.** Ensemble ν is an ϵ-approximate α-design if

$$\|\Delta_\alpha(\nu)\|_1 \leq \epsilon. \tag{147}$$

Lemma 24. *Let ω_α be an ϵ-approximate α-design with $\alpha \geq 2$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} \leq \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} + \frac{\epsilon}{D_{[\alpha]}}, \tag{148}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha} S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \geq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log\left(\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} + \frac{\epsilon}{D_{[\alpha]}}\right). \tag{149}$$

Proof. According to the same argument that leads to Eq. (116),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\omega_\alpha} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} &= \operatorname{tr}\left\{\mathbb{E}_\nu (|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)^{\otimes t} Q_\alpha\right\} = \frac{1}{D_{[\alpha]}} \operatorname{tr}\left\{(P_{[\alpha]} + \Delta_\alpha(\nu)) Q_\alpha\right\}, \\
&= \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} + \frac{1}{D_{[\alpha]}} \operatorname{tr}\left\{\Delta_\alpha(\nu) Q_\alpha\right\} \leq \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} + \frac{1}{D_{[\alpha]}} \|\Delta_\alpha(\nu)\|_1 \|Q_\alpha\| \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} + \frac{\epsilon}{D_{[\alpha]}},
\end{aligned} \tag{150}$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption $\|\Delta_\alpha(\nu)\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ and the fact that $\|Q_\alpha\| = 1$, since Q_α is unitary. □

We see that $S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \sim \log d_A$ as long as $\epsilon / D_{[\alpha]} = o(d_A^{1-\alpha})$. This leads to an entropic notion of designs: an ensemble of states ν has an α-design complexity if the average Rényi-α entanglement entropies are nearly maximal. For convenience, we call them Page complexities at the moment.

As an application of Lemma 24, let us consider the average Rényi entanglement entropy of Clifford orbits for a multiqubit system. For simplicity we assume $d_B = d_A \gg \alpha$, so that

$$\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} \approx \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A^{1-\alpha}, \quad \mathbb{E}\, S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \lesssim \log d_A - \frac{\log \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha}{\alpha - 1}. \tag{151}$$

Recall that the Clifford group is a unitary 3-design [61, 62], so any orbit of the Clifford group forms a 3-design. Consequently, the average Rényi α-entanglement entropy for $\alpha \leq 3$ of any Clifford orbit is close to the maximum,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{orb}(\psi)} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} \approx \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha d_A^{1-\alpha}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{orb}(\psi)} S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \lesssim \log d_A - \frac{\log \mathrm{Cat}_\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \tag{152}$$

for any ψ, where $\mathrm{orb}(\psi)$ denotes the Clifford orbit generated from ψ.

However, the Clifford group is not a four design, and Clifford orbits are in general not four designs [61–63]. If ψ is a stabilizer state, then $\|\Delta_4(\mathrm{orb}(\psi))\|_1 \approx d_A^6/12$ according to [34]. In this case the bounds for the fourth moment and Rényi 4-entropy provided by Lemma 24 is not very informative, note that $\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^4\} \approx 14 d_A^{-3}$ and $D_{[4]} \approx (d_A d_B)^4/24 = d_A^8/24$. For

a typical Clifford orbit, by contrast, $\|\Delta_\alpha(\nu)\|_1 \approx d_A^2$ is much smaller [34]. Now Lemma 24 implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{orb}(\psi)} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^4\} \le \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^4\} + \frac{\|\Delta_\alpha(\mathrm{orb}(\psi))\|_1}{D_{[\alpha]}} \approx 14 d_A^{-3} + 24 d_A^{-6} \approx \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^4\}. \tag{153}$$

Therefore, Eq. (152) also holds for typical Clifford orbits when $\alpha = 4$.

C. Hierarchy of Page complexities

1. *Nontrivial moments*

Again, the min entanglement entropy corresponds to the strongest entropic design complexity: if the average min entanglement entropies are always close to maximal, then we simply cannot distinguish the ensemble from completely random by the entanglement spectrum. The following theorem says that designs of order $O(\log d_A)$ have almost maximally uniform entanglement spectrum:

Theorem 25. *Suppose $|\psi\rangle$ is drawn from an α-design in a bipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ of dimension $d_A \times d_B$, where $\alpha = \lceil (\log d_A)/a \rceil \le (16 d_B^2)^{1/3}$ with $0 < a \le 1$. Let ρ_A be the reduced state of subsystem A. Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \|\rho_A\| \le \frac{2^{2+a}}{d_A}, \tag{154}$$

$$\mathbb{E} S_{\min}(\rho_A) \ge \log d_A - 2 - a. \tag{155}$$

In particular, $\mathbb{E} \|\rho_A\| \le 8/d_A$ and $\mathbb{E} S_{\min}(\rho_A) \ge \log d_A - 3$ if $\alpha = \lceil \log d_A \rceil$.

Proof. According to Lemma 18,

$$\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\} \le \frac{4^\alpha h(q)}{\sqrt{\pi}\alpha^{3/2}} d_A^{1-\alpha} \le \frac{5 \times 4^\alpha}{3\sqrt{\pi}\alpha^{3/2}} d_A^{1-\alpha} \le 4^\alpha d_A^{1-\alpha}, \tag{156}$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that $q = \alpha^3/(32 d_B^2) \le 1/2$ and $h(q) \le 5/3$ given that $\alpha^3 \le 16 d_B^2$ by assumption. Consequently

$$\mathbb{E} \|\rho_A\| \le (\mathbb{E} \|\rho_A\|^\alpha)^{1/\alpha} \le [\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_A^\alpha\}]^{1/\alpha} \le d_A^{1/\alpha} \frac{4}{d_A} \le d_A^{a/\log d_A} \frac{4}{d_A} = \frac{2^{2+a}}{d_A}, \tag{157}$$

$$\mathbb{E} S_{\min}(\rho_A) \ge -\log \mathbb{E} \|\rho_A\| \ge -\log \frac{2^{2+a}}{d_A} \ge \log d_A - 2 - a. \tag{158}$$

In the case, $a = 1$ and $\alpha = \lceil \log d_A \rceil$, the inequality $\alpha \le (16 d_A^2)^{1/3} \le (16 d_B^2)^{1/3}$ holds automatically; therefore, $\mathbb{E} \|\rho_A\| \le 8/d_A$ and $\mathbb{E} S_{\min}(\rho_A) \ge \log d_A - 3$. □

2. Gaps between Page complexities

In this random state setting, we are able to establish a clear gap between the second and α-th entropic design complexities with all $\alpha \geq 3$. In particular, we shall construct a family of 2-designs, the gap of whose average Rényi-α entanglement entropies from the maximum is unbounded for $\alpha > 2$. Our construction is based on the orbits of a special subgroup of the unitary group on $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. As mentioned before, any orbit of a unitary 2-design is a complex projective 2-design. What is interesting, our construction of projective 2-designs does not require unitary 2-designs. In this way, we also provide a novel recipe for constructing projective 2-designs, which is particularly useful when the dimension is not a prime power.

Consider the group $G := \mathrm{U}_A \otimes \mathrm{U}_B$, where $\mathrm{U}_A, \mathrm{U}_B$ are the unitary groups on $\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B$, respectively. It is irreducible, but does not form a 2-design. Simple analysis shows that G has four irreducible components on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}$, with dimensions $d_A d_B (d_a \pm 1)(d_B \pm 1)/4$, respectively. The symmetric subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}$ contains two irreducible components with dimensions $d_A d_B (d_a + 1)(d_B + 1)/4$ and $d_A d_B (d_a - 1)(d_B - 1)/4$. By a similar continuity argument as employed in [34], there must exist an orbit of G that forms a 2-design. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a fiducial vector of a 2-design with reduced state ρ_A for subsystem A. Then $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^2\}$ is necessarily equal to the average over the uniform ensemble, that is,

$$\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^2\} = \frac{d_A + d_B}{d_A d_B + 1}. \tag{159}$$

It turns out that this condition is also sufficient. To see this, note that the condition must be invariant under local unitary transformations and thus only depends on a symmetric polynomial of the eigenvalues of ρ_A of degree 2, which is necessarily a function of $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A^2\}$ given the normalization condition $\mathrm{tr}\{\rho_A\} = 1$. It is worth to point out that the same conclusion also holds if $\mathrm{U}_A, \mathrm{U}_B$ are replaced by groups that form unitary 2-designs on $\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B$, respectively.

Next we study Rényi entanglement entropies of 2-designs constructed from orbits of G. Note that Eq. (159) holds if ρ_A has the following spectrum

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{d_A d_B + 1 + (d_A - 1)\sqrt{(d_A + 1)(d_A d_B + 1)}}{d_A (d_A d_B + 1)}, \tag{160}$$

$$\lambda_2 = \cdots = \lambda_{d_A} = \frac{d_A d_B + 1 - \sqrt{(d_A + 1)(d_A d_B + 1)}}{d_A (d_A d_B + 1)}. \tag{161}$$

If $d_B \geq d_A^2$, then

$$\lambda_1 \leq \frac{d_A^3 + 1 + (d_A - 1)\sqrt{(d_A + 1)(d_A^3 + 1)}}{d_A(d_A^3 + 1)} < \frac{2}{d_A}. \tag{162}$$

Therefore, $S_{\min}(\rho_A) \geq \log d_A - 1$, and the gap of all Rényi entropies from the maximum is bounded.

We are mostly interested in the case in which the ratio d_B/d_A is bounded by a constant, say r. Then

$$\lambda_1 \geq \frac{\sqrt{(d_A + 1)(d_A d_B + 1)}}{d_A d_B + 1} \geq d_B^{-1/2} \geq (r d_A)^{-1/2}. \tag{163}$$

Consequently,

$$S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha}\lambda_1^\alpha \leq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha}(r d_A)^{-\alpha/2} = \frac{\alpha}{2(\alpha - 1)}(\log d_A + \log r). \tag{164}$$

As d_A increases, the gap of $S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A)$ from the maximum is unbounded whenever $\alpha > 2$.

We note that such construction cannot be directly generalized to establish gaps in the Choi setting. As mentioned, any orbit of a unitary t-design is a complex projective t-design, but to construct a projective t-design, a unitary t-design is not required. Here the complex projective 2-design is constructed using a group that is a tensor product. However, such a group can never be a unitary 2-design. Also, in the Choi setting, four parties are involved, and it is not easy to ensure unitarity using the idea for constructing projective designs. New approaches are necessary for such a construction.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper explores scrambling by establishing connections between entanglement entropies and degree of randomness. We find that there is a hierarchy of degrees of randomness that lies between the scrambling of information (Page scrambling) and complete randomness (Haar randomness). Our results directly relate the order of generalized entropies and designs: we show that α designs yield almost maximal Renji α entropies. Moreover, we show by min entanglement entropy that designs of order logarithmic in the dimension already exhibit almost maximally uniform entanglement spectrum, and are indistinguishable from Haar by spectral properties alone.

There are several open problems, especially in the Choi setting for unitary designs. For example, we are not yet able to give a construction that opens a gap between scrambling

at order α and scrambling at higher order, when $\alpha \geq 2$ in the Choi setting. That is, the gaps between the ≥ 2 scrambling complexities have not been proven. Although we exhibit such gaps for projective 2-designs in the random state setting, similar techniques cannot be directly generalized to unitaries, as explained earlier. Moreover, due to the lack of subadditivity, we know that the negative tripartite information in terms of Rényi entropies are not necessarily nonnegative. It is worth considering related problems such as when it can be negative, and further about the meanings of such derived quantities.

This work focuses mostly on the intrinsic mathematical properties of unitary channels and states, instead of on physical dynamics. The relations of our results to dynamics such as generalized fast scrambling remains speculative. It would be interesting to further explore the dynamics of e.g. black holes or quantum many-body systems, and aspects of fast scrambling, under our framework. We refer to [25] for a set of interesting results along this direction. We note that a recent paper [64] concerns a similar gap between maximum entropy and maximum complexity of quantum dynamics. Here the complexity roughly means the computational/gate complexity, which is rather difficult to rigorously analyze. It would also be interesting to further study the connections to their framework.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Dawei Ding, Alan Guth, Aram Harrow, Guang Hao Low, Yoshifumi Nakata, Kevin Thompson, and Quntao Zhuang for discussions related to this work. Special thank goes to Aram Harrow for bringing several helpful references to our attention. ZWL and SL are supported by AFOSR and ARO. EYZ is supported by the National Science Foundation under grant Contract Number CCF-1525130. HZ is supported by the Excellence Initiative of the German Federal and State Governments (ZUK 81) and the DFG. Research at MIT CTP is supported by DOE.

Appendix A: Inequalities of Rényi entropies of different orders

First, we present a series of inequalities relating Rényi entropies of different orders. It is well known that the Rényi entropy is monotonic nonincreasing with the parameter α, that is $S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho) \geq S_R^{(\beta)}(\rho)$ whenever $\beta \geq \alpha$. On the other hand, $S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho)$ can also be used to construct

a lower bound for $S_R^{(\beta)}(\rho)$ when $\beta \geq \alpha \geq 1$ as shown below,

$$S_R^{(\beta)}(\rho) = -\frac{1}{\beta-1}\log \mathrm{tr}\{\rho^\beta\} = -\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}\log(\mathrm{tr}\,\rho^\beta)^{1/\beta}$$
$$\geq -\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}\log(\mathrm{tr}\,\rho^\alpha)^{1/\alpha} = \frac{\beta}{\beta-1}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho). \tag{A1}$$

In particular, this equation yields a lower bound for the min entropy

$$S_{\min}(\rho) \geq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho) = S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho) - \frac{S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho)}{\alpha}. \tag{A2}$$

When $\alpha \geq \log d$, we have

$$S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho) - 1 \leq S_{\min}(\rho) \leq S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho), \tag{A3}$$

so the difference between $S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho)$ and $S_{\min}(\rho)$ is less than 1. When $\beta = \alpha + 1$, we have $S_R^{(\alpha+1)}(\rho) \geq \frac{\alpha^2-1}{\alpha^2}S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho)$, so the difference between $S_R^{(\alpha+1)}(\rho)$ and $S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho)$ is upper bounded by $S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho)/\alpha^2$.

Next we derive another lower bound for $S_R^{(\beta)}(\rho)$ in terms of $S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho)$ and the min entropy in the case $\beta \geq \alpha \geq 1$. The following equation

$$\mathrm{tr}\{\rho^\beta\} = \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho^\alpha \rho^{\beta-\alpha}\right) \leq \mathrm{tr}\{\rho^\alpha\}\|\rho\|^{\beta-\alpha} \tag{A4}$$

implies that

$$S_R^{(\beta)}(\rho) \geq \frac{1}{\beta-1}[(\alpha-1)S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho) + (\beta-\alpha)S_{\min}(\rho)]. \tag{A5}$$

In particular, any Rényi β-entropy with $\beta \geq 2$ is lower bounded by a convex combination of Rényi 2-entropy and the min entropy,

$$S_R^{(\beta)}(\rho) \geq \frac{1}{\beta-1}[S_R^{(2)}(\rho) + (\beta-2)S_{\min}(\rho)]. \tag{A6}$$

Appendix B: Weak subadditivity of Rényi entropy

It is known that Rényi α-entropy is not subadditive except for the special case $\alpha = 1$. The following lemma yields a weaker form of subadditivity:

Lemma 26. *Let ρ_{AB} be any bipartite state on the product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ with dimension $d_A \times d_B$. Let ρ_A, ρ_B be the two reduced states. Then*

$$\rho_{AB} \succ \rho_A \otimes \frac{I}{d_B}, \tag{B1}$$

$$S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AB}) \leq S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) + \log d_B, \tag{B2}$$

$$\log(d_A d_B) - S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AB}) \geq \log d_A - S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A). \tag{B3}$$

The first inequality in Lemma 26 means that the spectrum of ρ_{AB} majorizes that of $\rho_A \otimes \frac{I}{d_B}$. The second and third inequalities are immediate consequences of the first one, which are are equivalent. The second one can be seen as a weaker form of subadditivity, while the third one means that the gap of Rényi entropy of a joint state from the maximum is no smaller than the corresponding gap for each reduced state.

Proof. Let $|j\rangle$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, d_B - 1$ be an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H}_B$ and $P_j = |j\rangle\langle j|$ be the corresponding projectors. Let

$$\sigma = \sum_j (I \otimes P_j)\rho_{AB}(I \otimes P_j) = \sum_j \rho_j \otimes P_j, \tag{B4}$$

where ρ_j are subnormalized states that sum up to ρ_A. Define

$$\sigma_k = \sum_j \rho_j \otimes P_{j+k}, \quad k = 0, 1, \cdots, d_B - 1. \tag{B5}$$

where the addition in the indices is modulo d_B; note that $\sigma_0 = \sigma$. Then all σ_k have the same spectrum, which is majorized by ρ_{AB}, that is, $\rho_{AB} \succ \sigma_k$. Consequently,

$$\rho_{AB} \succ \frac{1}{d_B} \sum_{k=0}^{d_B-1} \sigma_k = \rho_A \otimes \frac{I}{d_B}. \tag{B6}$$

Since Rényi α-entropy is Schur concave for $0 \leq \alpha \leq \infty$, it follows that

$$S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_{AB}) \leq S_R^{(\alpha)}\left(\rho_A \otimes \frac{I}{d_B}\right) = S_R^{(\alpha)}(\rho_A) + \log d_B \tag{B7}$$

which confirms the second inequality in Lemma 26 and implies the third inequality.

□

Appendix C: A proof of Lemma 2

We include here an intuitive proof of Lemma 2 by induction. The intuition is that any element $\sigma \in S_\alpha$ can be viewed as a local deformation of some element $\sigma_- \in S_{\alpha-1}$, such that $\xi(\sigma) + \xi(\sigma\tau)$ can only increase by at most 1. We formalize the argument below.

Suppose the statement is true for $\alpha = k$. Now for some $\sigma \in S_{k+1}$, look at element $k + 1$. There are two possibilities:

1. $k+1$ appears in a cycle of length 1: $\sigma[k+1] = k+1$. So $\sigma = \sigma_-(k+1)$, where $\sigma_- \in S_k$. Write $\tau = (1\ 2\ \cdots\ k+1) = \tau_-(k\ k+1)$, where $\tau_- = (1\ 2\ \cdots\ k)$. Then $\sigma\tau = \sigma_-(k+1)\tau_-(k\ k+1) = \sigma_-\tau_-(k\ k+1)$, with $\sigma_-\tau_- \in S_k$. Compare the action of $\sigma_-\tau_-$ and $\sigma\tau$ on various elements. The only differences are: $\sigma_-\tau_-[k] = \sigma_-\tau_-[k]$, $\sigma\tau[k] = k+1$, $\sigma\tau[k+1] = \sigma_-\tau_-[k]$. it simply increases the length of a cycle in $\sigma_-\tau_-$ by 1, and does nothing to other cycles. So $\xi(\sigma\tau) = \xi(\sigma_-\tau_-)$. From the induction hypothesis, $\xi(\sigma_-) + \xi(\sigma_-\tau_-) \leq k+1$, so $\xi(\sigma) + \xi(\sigma\tau) = \xi(\sigma_-) + 1 + \xi(\sigma_-\tau_-) \leq k+2$.

2. $k+1$ appears in a cycle of length > 1: $\sigma[a] = k+1$, $\sigma[k+1] = b$ for some elements $a, b \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Define $\sigma'_- \in S_k$ by $\sigma'_-[i] = \sigma[i]$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \setminus \{a\}$ and $\sigma'_-[a] = b$. Now compare the action of $\sigma'_-\tau_-$ and $\sigma\tau$ on various elements. Depending on the value of a, there are two cases:

   (a) $a \neq 1$. The differences are: $\sigma'_-\tau_-[a-1] = b$ and $\sigma'_-\tau_-[k] = \sigma[1]$, but $\sigma\tau[a-1] = k+1$, $\sigma\tau[k] = b$ and $\sigma\tau[k+1] = \sigma[1]$. They act identically on all other elements. There are two possible effects:

      i. In $\sigma'_-\tau_-$, $\{a-1,\ b\}$ and $\{k,\ \sigma[1]\}$ belong to the same cycle. Then $\sigma\tau$ breaks this cycle into two disjoint ones involving $\{a-1,\ k+1,\ \sigma[1]\}$ and $\{k,\ b\}$ respectively. So $\xi(\sigma\tau) = \xi(\sigma'_-\tau_-) + 1$;

      ii. In $\sigma'_-\tau_-$, $\{a-1,\ b\}$ and $\{k,\ \sigma[1]\}$ belong to two disjoint cycles. Then $\sigma\tau$ glues these two cycles together into one. So $\xi(\sigma\tau) = \xi(\sigma'_-\tau_-) - 1$.

   (b) $a = 1$. Then $\sigma'_-\tau_-$ and $\sigma\tau$ act identically on $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ and in addition $\sigma\tau[k+1] = k+1$. So $\xi(\sigma\tau) = \xi(\sigma'_-\tau_-) + 1$.

   In conclusion, $\xi(\sigma\tau)$ can only increase by 1 or decrease by 1 as compared to $\xi(\sigma'_-\tau_-)$, so $\xi(\sigma) + \xi(\sigma\tau) = \xi(\sigma_-) + \xi(\sigma'_-\tau_-) \pm 1 \leq k+2$ in either case.

Lastly, consider $k = 1$. The only element of S_1 is (1), and $\xi((1)) + \xi((1)(1)) = 2 \leq k+1$, thus the statement trivially holds. This completes our proof.

Appendix D: Bounds on the Catalan numbers

It is well known that the Catalan number $\mathrm{Cat}_k = (2k)!/[k!(k+1)!]$ is approximated by $\frac{4^k}{\sqrt{\pi}k^{3/2}}$ when k is large. To make this statement more precise, here provide both lower and

upper bounds for Cat_k.

Lemma 27. *The Catalan number* Cat_k *satisfies*

$$\frac{4^k}{\sqrt{\pi}(k+1)^{3/2}} < \mathrm{Cat}_k < \frac{4^k}{\sqrt{\pi}k^{3/2}} \quad \forall k \geq 1, \tag{D1}$$

where k *is not necessarily an integer.*

Proof. The basis of our proof is the following Stirling approximation formula

$$\sqrt{2\pi}k^{k+\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-k} \leq k! \leq \sqrt{2\pi}k^{k+\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-k}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{12k}}. \tag{D2}$$

As an implication,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cat}_k &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}(2k)^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-2k}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{24k}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}k^{k+\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-k}\sqrt{2\pi}(k+1)^{k+\frac{3}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-k-1}} = \frac{2^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}k^k\mathrm{e}^{1+\frac{1}{24k}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(k+1)^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{2^{2k}\mathrm{e}^{1+\frac{1}{24k}}}{\sqrt{\pi}k^{\frac{3}{2}}(1+\frac{1}{k})^{k+\frac{3}{2}}} < \frac{2^{2k}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{24k}}}{\sqrt{\pi}k^{\frac{3}{2}}(1+\frac{1}{k})} < \frac{4^k}{\sqrt{\pi}k^{\frac{3}{2}}}.\end{aligned} \tag{D3}$$

Here the second inequality follows from the inequality

$$\left(1+\frac{1}{k}\right)^{k+\frac{1}{2}} > \mathrm{e}, \tag{D4}$$

note that the left hand side is monotonically decreasing with k and approaches e in the limit $k \to \infty$.

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cat}_k &\geq \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}(2k)^{2k+\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-2k}}{\sqrt{2\pi}k^{k+\frac{1}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-k}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{12k}}\sqrt{2\pi}(k+1)^{k+\frac{3}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{-k-1}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{12(k+1)}}} = \frac{2^{2k}k^k\mathrm{e}}{\sqrt{\pi}(k+1)^{k+\frac{3}{2}}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{12k}+\frac{1}{12(k+1)}}} \\ &= \frac{4^k\mathrm{e}}{\sqrt{\pi}(k+1)^{\frac{3}{2}}(1+\frac{1}{k})^k\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{12k}+\frac{1}{12(k+1)}}} > \frac{4^k}{\sqrt{\pi}(k+1)^{\frac{3}{2}}}.\end{aligned} \tag{D5}$$

Here the last inequality follows from the inequality

$$\left(1+\frac{1}{k}\right)^k \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{12k}+\frac{1}{12(k+1)}} < \mathrm{e}. \tag{D6}$$

To confirm this claim, we shall prove the equivalent inequality

$$f(k) := \ln\left[\left(1+\frac{1}{k}\right)^k \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{12k}+\frac{1}{12(k+1)}}\right] < 1. \tag{D7}$$

The first and second derivatives of $f(k)$ read

$$f'(k) = \ln\Big(\frac{k+1}{k}\Big) - \frac{1}{k+1} - \frac{1}{12k^2} - \frac{1}{12(k+1)^2},$$
$$f''(k) = -\frac{1}{k(k+1)} + \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} + \frac{1}{6k^3} + \frac{1}{6(k+1)^3} = -\frac{1}{6k^3(k+1)^3}(4k^3+3k^2-3k-1) < 0. \tag{D8}$$

Since $f''(k)$ is positive, $f'(k)$ is monotonically decreasing, which implies that $f'(k) > 0$ given that $\lim_{k\to\infty} f'(k) = 0$. Consequently, $f(k)$ is monotonically increasing, which confirms our claim $f(k) < 1$ given that $\lim_{k\to\infty} f(k) = 1$. □

The following two corollaries are easy consequences of Lemma 27, though it is straightforward to prove them directly.

Corollary 28. $\mathrm{Cat}_k \le \mathrm{Cat}_{k+1}$ *for any positive integer* k.

Proof. The corollary holds for $k = 0, 1$ by direct calculation. When $k \ge 2$, Lemma 27 implies that

$$\frac{\mathrm{Cat}_{k+1}}{\mathrm{Cat}_k} \ge \frac{4k^{3/2}}{(k+2)^{3/2}} \ge \frac{4}{2^{3/2}} = \sqrt{2} > 1, \tag{D9}$$

which confirms the corollary. □

Corollary 29. $\mathrm{Cat}_j\mathrm{Cat}_k < \mathrm{Cat}_{j+k}$ *for arbitrary positive integers* j, k.

Proof. The corollary holds when $j = 1$ or $k = 1$ according to Corollary 28, given that $c_1 = 1$. When $j, k \ge 2$, Lemma 27 implies that

$$\frac{\mathrm{Cat}_j\mathrm{Cat}_k}{\mathrm{Cat}_{j+k}} < \frac{(j+k+1)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\pi}j^{3/2}k^{3/2}} < 1. \tag{D10}$$

□

Appendix E: Bounds on the Möbius function

Recall the definition of the Möbius function,

$$\mathrm{Moeb}(\sigma) := \prod_{j=1}^{k}(-1)^{|C_j|}c_{|C_j|} = (-1)^{|\sigma|}\prod_{j=1}^{k}c_{|C_j|}. \tag{E1}$$

Lemma 30.

$$1 \leq |\mathrm{Moeb}(\sigma)| \leq c_{|\sigma|} < \frac{4^{|\sigma|}}{\sqrt{\pi}|\sigma|^{3/2}} \quad \forall |\sigma| \geq 1. \tag{E2}$$

The lower bound is saturated iff σ is the identity or a product of disjoint transpositions. The upper bound $|\mathrm{Moeb}(\sigma)| \leq c_{|\sigma|}$ is saturated iff σ is a cycle of length $|\sigma|+1$.

Proof. The lemma holds when σ is the identity. Otherwise, suppose σ has disjoint cycle decomposition $\sigma = C_1 C_2 \cdots C_k$, where C_j for $1 \leq j \leq k$ are nontrivial cycles. Then

$$|\mathrm{Moeb}(\sigma)| = \prod_{j=1}^{k} c_{|C_j|} \geq 1 \tag{E3}$$

given that $c_{|C_j|} \geq 1$ for all j. The inequality is saturated iff $|C_j| = 1$ for all j, that is, σ is a product of disjoint transpositions. On the other hand,

$$|\mathrm{Moeb}(\sigma)| = \prod_{j=1}^{k} c_{|C_j|} \leq c_{\sum_j |C_j|} = c_{|\sigma|} < \frac{4^{|\sigma|}}{\sqrt{\pi}|\sigma|^{3/2}}, \tag{E4}$$

where the two inequalities follow from Corollary 29 and Lemma 27, respectively. The first inequality is saturated when $k = 1$, but is strict whenever $k \geq 2$. So the upper bound $|\mathrm{Moeb}(\sigma)| \leq c_{|\sigma|}$ is saturated iff σ is a cycle of length $|\sigma|+1$. □

Appendix F: Bounds on the Weingarten function

The following theorem is reproduced from [65],

Theorem 31. *When $d > \sqrt{6}k^{7/4}$, any $\sigma \in S_k$ satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{1-\frac{k-1}{d^2}} \leq \frac{d^{k+|\sigma|}\mathrm{Wg}(\sigma, d)}{\mathrm{Moeb}(\sigma)} \leq a_k := \frac{1}{1-\frac{6k^{7/2}}{d^2}}. \tag{F1}$$

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of Theorem 31 and Lemma 30.

Lemma 32. *When $d > \sqrt{6}k^{7/4}$, any $\sigma \in S_k$ satisfies*

$$d^k |\mathrm{Wg}(\sigma, d)| \leq \begin{cases} a_k (\frac{1}{d})^{|\sigma|} & |\sigma| = 0, 1, \\ \min\left\{ \frac{a_k (\frac{4}{d})^{|\sigma|}}{\sqrt{\pi}|\sigma|^{3/2}}, \frac{a_k (\frac{4}{d})^{|\sigma|}}{8} \right\} & |\sigma| \geq 2, \end{cases} \tag{F2}$$

where a_k is defined in Theorem 31.

Lemma 33. *Suppose $d > \sqrt{6}k^{7/4}$; then*

$$\sum_{\sigma\in A_k} d^k \mathrm{Wg}(\sigma, d) \le \frac{a_k}{8}\left[7 + \cosh\frac{2k(k-1)}{d}\right]. \tag{F3}$$

Proof. According to Lemma 32,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\sigma\in A_k} d^k \mathrm{Wg}(\sigma, d) \le a_k + \sum_{\sigma\in A_k\ |\sigma|\ge 2} d^k \mathrm{Wg}(\sigma, d) \le a_k + \frac{a_k}{8}\sum_{\sigma\in A_k\ |\sigma|\ge 2}\left(\frac{4}{d}\right)^{|\sigma|} \\
&\le \frac{7a_k}{8} + \frac{a_k}{8}\sum_{\sigma\in A_k}\left(\frac{4}{d}\right)^{|\sigma|} = \frac{7a_k}{8} + \frac{a_k}{8}\sum_{\sigma\in A_k}\left(\frac{4}{d}\right)^{k-\xi(\sigma)} \\
&= \frac{7a_k}{8} + \frac{a_k}{8}\left(\frac{4}{d}\right)^k \sum_{\sigma\in A_k}\left(\frac{d}{4}\right)^{\xi(\sigma)} \\
&= \frac{7a_k}{8} + \frac{a_k}{16}\left(\frac{4}{d}\right)^k \left[\sum_{\sigma\in S_k}\left(\frac{d}{4}\right)^{\xi(\sigma)} + \sum_{\sigma\in S_k}\left(-\frac{d}{4}\right)^{\xi(\sigma)}\right] \\
&= \frac{7a_k}{8} + \frac{a_k}{16}\left(\frac{4}{d}\right)^k \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1}\left(\frac{d}{4}+j\right) + \prod_{j=0}^{k-1}\left(\frac{d}{4}-j\right)\right] \\
&= \frac{7a_k}{8} + \frac{a_k}{16}\left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1}\left(1+\frac{4j}{d}\right) + \prod_{j=0}^{k-1}\left(1-\frac{4j}{d}\right)\right] \\
&\le \frac{7a_k}{8} + \frac{a_k}{16}\left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1}\mathrm{e}^{4j/d} + \prod_{j=0}^{k-1}\mathrm{e}^{-4j/d}\right] = \frac{7a_k}{8} + \frac{a_k}{16}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}4j/d} + \mathrm{e}^{-\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}4j/d}\right] \\
&= \frac{7a_k}{8} + \frac{a_k}{16}\left[\mathrm{e}^{2k(k-1)/d} + \mathrm{e}^{-2k(k-1)/d}\right] = \frac{a_k}{8}\left[7 + \cosh\frac{2k(k-1)}{d}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{F4}$$

□

Appendix G: Bounds on the number of permutations with a given genus

In this appendix, we provide an easy-to-use upper bound for the number of permutations with a given genus (Lemma 37 below), which plays a crucial role in understanding Rényi entanglement entropies of Haar random states as well as states drawn from designs.

The basis of our endeavor is the following theorem due to Goupil and Schaeffer [66].

Theorem 34. *The number of permutations in the symmetric group S_n with genus g is given by*

$$c_{g,n} = \frac{(n+1)_{2g}}{(n+1)2^{2g}} \sum_{g_1+g_2=g} \sum_{\substack{0\le\ell_1\le g_1\\ 0\le\ell_2\le g_2}} a_{g_1,\ell_1} a_{g_2,\ell_2} (n+1-2g)_{\ell_1+\ell_2} \binom{2n-2g-\ell_1-\ell_2}{n-2g_1-\ell_1}, \tag{G1}$$

where $(n)_k := n(n-1)\cdots,(n-k+1)$, $a_{0,0}=1$, $a_{g,0}=0$ *for* $g\geq 1$, *and*

$$a_{g,\ell} = \sum_{\substack{\gamma\vdash g,\ \ell(\gamma)=\ell \\ \gamma=1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j!(2j+1)^{c_j}} \quad 0<\ell\leq g. \tag{G2}$$

Here the summation runes over all partition γ *of* g, *the expression* $\gamma = 1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}$ *means that* γ *has* c_j *parts equal to* j, *and* $\ell(\gamma)=\sum_j c_j$ *denotes the number of parts of* γ.

In addition, we need two auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 35. $a_{g,\ell}\leq 2^{-\ell}$ *for all* $0\leq\ell\leq g$.

Proof. By definition, the lemma holds when $g=0$, or $g\geq 1$ and $\ell=0$. Now suppose $0<\ell\leq g$; then

$$\begin{aligned} a_{g,\ell} &= \sum_{\substack{\gamma\vdash g,\ \ell(\gamma)=\ell \\ \gamma=1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j!(2j+1)^{c_j}} = \sum_{\substack{\gamma\vdash g,\ \ell(\gamma)=\ell \\ \gamma=1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}}} \left[\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j! j^{c_j}} \prod_{j=1}^{g}\Big(\frac{j}{2j+1}\Big)^{c_j}\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{\gamma\vdash g,\ \ell(\gamma)=\ell \\ \gamma=1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}}} \left[\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j! j^{c_j}} \prod_{j=1}^{g}\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Big)^{c_j}\right] = \sum_{\substack{\gamma\vdash g,\ \ell(\gamma)=\ell \\ \gamma=1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}}} \left[\frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j! j^{c_j}} 2^{-\sum_{j=1}^{g} c_j}\right] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\gamma\vdash g,\ \ell(\gamma)=\ell \\ \gamma=1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j! j^{c_j}} 2^{-\ell(\gamma)} = 2^{-\ell} \sum_{\substack{\gamma\vdash g,\ \ell(\gamma)=\ell \\ \gamma=1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j! j^{c_j}} \leq 2^{-\ell}. \end{aligned} \tag{G3}$$

Here the last inequality can be derived as follows. Note that $\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j! j^{c_j}$ is the order of the centralizer in S_g of each element in the conjugacy class labeled by the partition γ. Therefore, $g!/\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j! j^{c_j}$ is the number of elements in this conjugacy class, so that

$$\sum_{\substack{\gamma\vdash g \\ \gamma=1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}}} \frac{g!}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j! j^{c_j}} = g!, \tag{G4}$$

which amounts to the identity

$$\sum_{\substack{\gamma\vdash g \\ \gamma=1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j! j^{c_j}} = 1. \tag{G5}$$

As an immediate consequence,

$$\sum_{\substack{\gamma\vdash g,\ \ell(\gamma)=\ell \\ \gamma=1^{c_1}2^{c_2}g^{c_g}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} c_j! j^{c_j}} \leq 1. \tag{G6}$$

□

Lemma 36. *Suppose j, k, n are nonnegative integers satisfying $j \le n$, $k < 2n$, and $k \le n+j$. Then*

$$\binom{2n-k}{n-j} \le 2^{-k}\sqrt{\frac{n}{n-\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}}\binom{2n}{n}. \tag{G7}$$

Proof. Straightforward calculation shows that

$$\binom{2n-k}{n-j} \le \binom{2n-k}{n-\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} = \binom{2n-k}{n-\lceil k/2 \rceil}. \tag{G8}$$

So without loss of generality, we may assume that $j = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\binom{2n}{n}}{\binom{2n-k}{n-j}} &= \frac{(2n)!(n-j)!(n+j-k)!}{(2n-k)!n!n!} = \frac{2n(2n-1)\cdots(2n-k+1)}{[n(n-1)\cdots n-j+1][n(n-1)\cdots(n+j-k+1)]} \\ &= \frac{2^k n(n-\frac{1}{2})\cdots(n-\frac{k}{2}+\frac{1}{2})}{[n(n-1)\cdots n-j+1][n(n-1)\cdots(n+j-k+1)]} = 2^k f, \end{aligned} \tag{G9}$$

where

$$f = \frac{(n-\frac{1}{2})(n-\frac{3}{2})\cdots(n-j+\frac{1}{2})}{n(n-1)\cdots(n-j+1)}. \tag{G10}$$

The square of f can be bounded from below as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} f^2 &= \frac{(n-\frac{1}{2})^2(n-\frac{3}{2})^2\cdots(n-j+\frac{1}{2})^2}{n^2(n-1)^2\cdots(n-j+1)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{n}\times\frac{(n-\frac{1}{2})^2}{n(n-1)}\times\cdots\times\frac{(n-j+\frac{3}{2})^2}{(n-j+2)(n-j+1)}\times\frac{(n-j+\frac{1}{2})^2}{n-j+1} \\ &\ge \frac{1}{n}\times\frac{(n-j+\frac{1}{2})^2}{n-j+1} \ge \frac{n-j}{n} = \frac{n-\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor}{n}. \end{aligned} \tag{G11}$$

Therefore $f \ge \sqrt{\frac{n-\lfloor k/2 \rfloor}{n}}$, from which the lemma follows. □

Lemma 37.

$$\frac{c_{g,n}}{c_{0,n}} \le \frac{(g+1)n^{3g}}{2^{6g}}, \quad \frac{c_{g,n}}{c_{0,n}} \le \frac{2}{3}\left(\frac{n^3}{32}\right)^g \quad \forall 1 \le g \le \frac{n-1}{2}. \tag{G12}$$

Proof of Lemma 37. Recall that $c_{0,n} = c_n = (2n)!/[n!(n+1)!]$. The values of $c_{1,n}, c_{2,n}$ can be computed explicitly according to Theorem 34, with the result

$$c_{1,n} = \frac{n(n-1)}{6}\binom{2n-3}{n} = \frac{(2n-3)!}{6(n-2)!(n-3)!}, \tag{G13}$$

$$c_{2,n} = \frac{(2n-5)!(5n^2-7n+6)}{720(n-3)!(n-5)!}. \tag{G14}$$

The coefficients $a_{g,\ell}$ necessary for deriving this result are given by

$$a_{00} = 1, \quad a_{1,1} = \frac{1}{3}, \quad a_{2,1} = \frac{1}{5}, \quad a_{2,2} = \frac{1}{18}. \tag{G15}$$

As a consequence,

$$\frac{c_{1,n}}{c_{0,n}} = \frac{n(n+1)(n-1)(n-2)}{24(2n-1)} \leq \frac{n^3}{48}, \tag{G16}$$

$$\frac{c_{2,n}}{c_{0,n}} = \frac{(n+1)n(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)(n-4)(5n^2-7n+6)}{5760(2n-1)(2n-3)} \leq \frac{n^6}{4608}. \tag{G17}$$

Therefore, Lemma 37 holds when $g = 1, 2$. Now suppose $g \geq 3$, so that $n \geq 7$. According to Theorem 34, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{c_{g,n}}{c_{0,n}} &= \frac{(n+1)_{2g}}{2^{2g}} \sum_{g_1+g_2=g} \sum_{\substack{0\leq \ell_1 \leq g_1 \\ 0 \leq \ell_2 \leq g_2}} a_{g_1,\ell_1} a_{g_2,\ell_2} (n+1-2g)_{\ell_1+\ell_2} \frac{\binom{2n-2g-\ell_1-\ell_2}{n-2g_1-\ell_1}}{\binom{2n}{n}} \\
&\leq \frac{(n+1)_{2g}}{2^{2g}} \sum_{g_1+g_2=g} \sum_{\substack{0\leq \ell_1 \leq g_1 \\ 0 \leq \ell_2 \leq g_2}} a_{g_1,\ell_1} a_{g_2,\ell_2} (n+1-2g)_{\ell_1+\ell_2} \times 2^{-(2g+\ell_1+\ell_2)} \sqrt{\frac{n}{n-g-\lfloor(\ell_1+\ell_2)/2\rfloor}} \\
&\leq \frac{(n+1)_{2g}}{2^{4g}} \sum_{g_1+g_2=g} \sum_{\substack{0\leq \ell_1 \leq g_1 \\ 0 \leq \ell_2 \leq g_2}} 2^{-(\ell_1+\ell_2)} a_{g_1,\ell_1} a_{g_2,\ell_2} \frac{n(n+1-2g)_{\ell_1+\ell_2}}{n-g-\lfloor(\ell_1+\ell_2)/2\rfloor} \\
&\leq \frac{(n+1)_{2g}}{2^{4g}} \sum_{g_1+g_2=g} \sum_{\substack{0\leq \ell_1 \leq g_1 \\ 0 \leq \ell_2 \leq g_2}} 4^{-(\ell_1+\ell_2)} n^{\ell_1+\ell_2} \frac{\max\{0, n+2-2g-(\ell_1+\ell_2)\}}{n-g-\lfloor(\ell_1+\ell_2)/2\rfloor}.
\end{aligned} \tag{G18}$$

Here the first inequality follows from Lemma 36, and the last one from Lemma 35 and the fact that $a_{g,0} = 0$ for $g > 0$. The fraction at the end of the above equation is no larger than 1 given that $g \geq 3$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{c_{g,n}}{c_{0,n}} &\leq \frac{(n+1)_{2g}}{2^{4g}} \sum_{g_1+g_2=g} \sum_{\substack{0\leq \ell_1 \leq g_1 \\ 0 \leq \ell_2 \leq g_2}} \left(\frac{n}{4}\right)^{-(\ell_1+\ell_2)} = \frac{(n+1)_{2g}}{2^{4g}} \sum_{g_1+g_2=g} \frac{[\left(\frac{n}{4}\right)^{g_1+1}-1]}{\frac{n}{4}-1} \frac{[\left(\frac{n}{4}\right)^{g_2+1}-1]}{\frac{n}{4}-1} \\
&\leq \frac{(n+1)_{2g}}{2^{4g}} \frac{1}{(\frac{n}{4}-1)^2} \sum_{g_1+g_2=g} \left(\frac{n}{4}\right)^{g+2} = \frac{(n+1)_{2g}}{2^{4g}} \frac{(g+1)\left(\frac{n}{4}\right)^{g+2}}{(\frac{n}{4}-1)^2} \\
&= \frac{(g+1)n^{g+2}(n+1)_{2g}}{2^{6g}(n-4)^2} \leq \frac{(g+1)n^{3g-3}(n+1)(n-1)(n-2)(n-3)(n-4)}{2^{6g}(n-4)^2} \\
&\leq \frac{(g+1)n^{3g}}{2^{6g}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{G19}$$

This result confirms the first inequality in Lemma 37 in the remaining case $g \geq 3$, which in turn implies the second inequality in the lemma. □

Appendix H: Partially scrambling unitary

Here we analyze the partially scrambling unitary model proposed in [40], which can lead to a large separation between von Neumann and Rényi-2 entanglement entropies and

tripartite information in the Choi state setting. More explicitly, let $\tilde{U}$ be a unitary that perfectly scrambles on almost the whole space besides a small subspace. Then, on the one hand, $\tilde{U}$ still has nearly maximal $-I_3$ due to continuity; while on the other hand, $-I_3^{(2)}$ can be gapped from maximum by $\Theta(\log d)$. However, we find that this model is not likely to provide clear separations between Rényi entropies of order ≥ 2.

The generalized partially scrambling unitary is defined as follows. Given α, define

$$\tilde{U}|mo\rangle = \begin{cases} U_S|mo\rangle & 0 \leq m, o < D \\ |mo\rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{H1}$$

where U_S is α-scrambling, and $D \leq \sqrt{d}$ controls the size of this α-scrambling subspace (labeled by subscript S). Then the Choi state of $\tilde{U}$ is

$$|\tilde{U}\rangle = \frac{D}{\sqrt{d}}|U_S\rangle_{A_S B_S C_S D_S} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{D \leq m < \sqrt{d} \wedge D \leq o < \sqrt{d}} |mo\rangle_{AB} \otimes |mo\rangle_{CD}. \tag{H2}$$

The question is whether there exists some D that can lead to separations between higher Rényi entropies associated with this Choi state, say α and α', $\alpha' > \alpha \geq 2$. To establish such separations, we need to show a large ($\Theta(\log d)$) gap between Rényi-α' entropies and the maximum for some small D, as well as upper bound the difference between Rényi-α entropies and the maximum by continuity. The gap side can work out by directly generalizing the corresponding calculation in [40]: Let $\beta = \frac{\log(\sqrt{d}-D)}{\log \sqrt{d}}$. Then $\log d - S_R^{(\alpha')}(\mathrm{tr}_{BD}|\tilde{U}\rangle\langle\tilde{U}|) = \Theta(\log d)$ as long as β is a positive constant. However, we find that the continuity bound for unified entropies can only give trivial results on the continuity side:

Lemma 38 (Generalized Fannes' inequality [29])**.** *Let ρ and ρ' be density operators in Hilbert space of dimension d. Denote $\epsilon = D_{\mathrm{tr}}(\rho, \rho')$. For $\alpha > 1$ and $s \geq 0$:*

$$|S^{(\alpha,s)}(\rho) - S^{(\alpha,s)}(\rho')| \leq \chi_s[\epsilon^\alpha \log_\alpha(d-1) + H^{(\alpha)}(\epsilon, 1-\epsilon)], \tag{H3}$$

where $\chi_s = 1$ for $s \geq 1$, and $\chi_s = d^{2(\alpha-1)}$ for $s = 0$. $H^{(\alpha)}$ denotes the α binary entropy.

It can be seen that this generalized Fannes' bound for Rényi grows with the dimension d for $\alpha > 1$, which indicates that even a tiny non-scrambling subspace may perturb the Rényi entropies drastically. Indeed, some simple scaling analysis can confirm that this bound is trivial even for Rényi-2. Notice that $\epsilon = D_{\mathrm{tr}}(\mathrm{tr}_{BD}|\tilde{U}\rangle\langle\tilde{U}|, I) \leq O(D/\log\sqrt{d}) = O(d^{(\beta-1)/2})$.

Then it must hold that $2(\alpha-1)+\alpha\frac{\beta-1}{2}<0$ so that $\log d - S_R^{(\alpha)}(\mathrm{tr}_{BD}|\tilde{U}\rangle\langle\tilde{U}|) = o(\log d)$. This gives $\beta < -3+4/\alpha$, which has no overlap with the $\beta > 0$ solution on the gap side when $\alpha \geq 2$. Equivalently, by plugging in $\beta > 0$ we can solve that the desired separation can exist when $\alpha' < 2$. Summarizing, in order to have a nontrivial bound on Rényi entropies D needs to be $o(1)$, which is meaningless. This is hardly surprising: one expects that Rényi entropies are very sensitive, especially in the near-maximum regime, due to the logarithm. In fact, we are able to obtain a large gap on the α' side basically because of such exponential sensitivity. Suppose we consider $s > 0$ entropies instead. Then the continuity bound is strong since $\chi_s = 1$, but it becomes hard to find a gap on the other side. There is a fundamental tradeoff between sensitivity and robustness in these unified entropies. In conclusion, we believe that partially scrambling unitaries are not likely to produce clear separations between generalized entropies in the Choi model.

Appendix I: Proof of Lemma 22

To prove Lemma 22, we need to introduce several auxiliary concepts and lemmas. An $m \times s$ matrix G is a (standard) Gaussian random matrix if the entries of G are i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables (with mean 0 and variance 1). It is a complex Gaussian random matrix if its real part and imaginary part are independent Gaussian random matrices.

Lemma 39. *Suppose G is a standard $m \times s$ real Gaussian random matrix. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\,\|G\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}\Gamma\left(\frac{m+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m}{2}\right)} + \frac{\sqrt{2}\Gamma\left(\frac{s+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{s}{2}\right)} \leq \sqrt{m} + \sqrt{s}. \tag{I1}$$

Usually this lemma is stated without the intermediate term, as it appears in [67]. However, the first inequality is essential to achieve our goal. Fortunately, this inequality is already implied by the proof in [67]. Note that $\sqrt{2}\Gamma\left(\frac{m+1}{2}\right)/\Gamma\left(\frac{m}{2}\right)$ is the average norm of a vector composed of m iid standard Gaussian random variables, while $\sqrt{m}$ is the root mean square norm. This observation implies the second inequality in the lemma, which is nearly tight when m, s are large.

Lemma 40. *Suppose G is a standard $m \times s$ complex Gaussian random matrix. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\,\|G\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\Gamma\left(\frac{m+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m}{2}\right)} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}\Gamma\left(\frac{s+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{s}{2}\right)} \leq 2\sqrt{m} + 2\sqrt{s}. \tag{I2}$$

This lemma is an immediate consequence of the triangle inequality and Lemma 39 applied to the real and imaginary parts of G.

Lemma 41.

$$\mathbb{E}\,\|\rho_A\|^a = \frac{\Gamma(k)\,\mathbb{E}\,\|G\|^{2a}}{2^a\Gamma(k+a)} \quad \forall a \geq 0, \tag{I3}$$

where G is a complex (real) Gaussian random matrix of size $d_A \times d_B$ and $k = d_A d_B$ ($k = d_A d_B/2$ in the real case).

Proof. It is well known that $G/\|G\|_2$ considered as a unit vector in $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is distributed uniformly. In addition, the spectrum of $G/\|G\|_2$ is independent of the Frobenius norm $\|G\|_2 = \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}\{GG^\dagger\}}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\,\|G\|^{2a} = \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}\{GG^\dagger\}]^a\,\mathbb{E}\left\|\frac{G}{\|G\|_2}\right\|^{2a} = \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}\{GG^\dagger\}]^a\,\mathbb{E}\,\|\rho_A\|^a = \frac{2^a\Gamma(k+a)}{\Gamma(k)}\,\mathbb{E}\,\|\rho_A\|^a, \tag{I4}$$

from which the lemma follows. Here the last equality in the above equation follows from the fact that $\mathrm{tr}\{GG^\dagger\}$ obeys χ^2-distribution with $2k$-degrees of freedom and pdf.

$$f(x) = \frac{x^{k-1}\mathrm{e}^{-x/2}}{2^k\Gamma(k)}, \tag{I5}$$

which satisfies

$$\int x^a f(x)\mathrm{d}x = \frac{2^a\Gamma(k+a)}{\Gamma(k)} \quad \forall a \geq 0. \tag{I6}$$

□

Proof. According to Lemmas 41 and 39, in the real case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\,\sqrt{\|\rho_A\|} &= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{d_A d_B}{2}\right)\mathbb{E}\,\|G\|}{\sqrt{2}\Gamma(\frac{d_A d_B+1}{2})} \leq \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{d_A d_B}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{2}\Gamma(\frac{d_A d_B+1}{2})}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}\Gamma\left(\frac{d_A+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d_A}{2}\right)} + \frac{\sqrt{2}\Gamma\left(\frac{d_B+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d_B}{2}\right)}\right) \\ &= \frac{\gamma(d_B)}{\gamma(d_A d_B)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_A}} + \frac{\gamma(d_A)}{\gamma(d_A d_B)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_B}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_A}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_B}},\end{aligned} \tag{I7}$$

where $\gamma(m) := \Gamma(\frac{m+1}{2})/(\sqrt{m}\Gamma(\frac{m}{2}))$, and the last inequality follows from the fact that $\gamma(m)$ is monotonic increasing with m for $m \geq 1$. This conclusion is intuitive if we observe that $\gamma(m)$ is equal to the ratio of the mean length over the root mean square length of a standard Gaussian random vector with m components. To derive an analytical proof, we can compute the log-derivative of $\gamma(m)$ with respect to m, note that the definition of $\gamma(m)$ can be extended to positive real numbers. Straightforward calculations shows that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln\gamma(m)}{\mathrm{d}m} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\psi^{(0)}\Big(\frac{m+1}{2}\Big) - \psi^{(0)}\Big(\frac{m}{2}\Big) - \frac{1}{m}\right] \geq \frac{1}{4}\left[\psi^{(0)}\Big(\frac{m+2}{2}\Big) - \psi^{(0)}\Big(\frac{m}{2}\Big) - \frac{2}{m}\right] = 0. \tag{I8}$$

Here $\psi^{(0)}$ denotes the digamma function (instead of a ket), the inequality follows from the concavity of $\psi^{(0)}$, and the last equality follows from the identity $\psi^{(0)}(x+1) = \psi^{(0)}(x) + \frac{1}{x}$.

In the complex case, Lemmas 41 and 40 imply that

$$\mathbb{E}\sqrt{\|\rho_A\|} \leq \sqrt{2}\left(\frac{\gamma(d_B)}{\gamma(2d_Ad_B)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_A}} + \frac{\gamma(d_A)}{\gamma(2d_Ad_B)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_B}}\right) \leq \sqrt{2}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d_A}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_B}}\right), \qquad \text{(I9)}$$

where the second inequality follows from the monotonicity of $\gamma(\cdot)$, as in the real case. □

---

[1] P. Hayden and J. Preskill, Journal of High Energy Physics **2007**, 120 (2007).

[2] Y. Sekino and L. Susskind, Journal of High Energy Physics **10**, 065 (2008), arXiv:0808.2096 [hep-th].

[3] L. Susskind, ArXiv e-prints (2011), arXiv:1101.6048 [hep-th].

[4] S. W. Hawking, Nature **248**, 30 (1974).

[5] S. W. Hawking, Comm. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975).

[6] S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **13**, 191 (1976).

[7] R. Nandkishore and D. A. Huse, Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics **6**, 15 (2015).

[8] P. Hosur, X.-L. Qi, D. A. Roberts, and B. Yoshida, Journal of High Energy Physics **2016**, 1 (2016).

[9] S. H. Shenker and D. Stanford, Journal of High Energy Physics **2014**, 67 (2014).

[10] S. H. Shenker and D. Stanford, Journal of High Energy Physics **2014**, 46 (2014).

[11] D. A. Roberts, D. Stanford, and L. Susskind, Journal of High Energy Physics **2015**, 51 (2015).

[12] D. A. Roberts and D. Stanford, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 131603 (2015).

[13] J. Maldacena, S. H. Shenker, and D. Stanford, Journal of High Energy Physics **2016**, 106 (2016).

[14] I. Kukuljan, S. Grozdanov, and T. Prosen, ArXiv e-prints (2017), arXiv:1701.09147 [cond-mat.stat-mech].

[15] S. H. Shenker and D. Stanford, Journal of High Energy Physics **2015**, 132 (2015).

[16] D. A. Roberts and B. Yoshida, ArXiv e-prints (2016), arXiv:1610.04903 [quant-ph].

[17] P. Caputa, T. Numasawa, and A. Veliz-Osorio, ArXiv e-prints (2016), arXiv:1602.06542 [hep-th].

[18] Y. Huang, Y.-L. Zhang, and X. Chen, Annalen der Physik , n/a (2016).

[19] R. Fan, P. Zhang, H. Shen, and H. Zhai, ArXiv e-prints (2016), arXiv:1608.01914 [cond-mat.quant-gas].

[20] X. Chen, T. Zhou, D. A. Huse, and E. Fradkin, Annalen der Physik , 1600332 (2016), 1600332.

[21] D. N. Page, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1291 (1993).

[22] E. Knill, eprint arXiv:quant-ph/9508006 (1995), quant-ph/9508006.

[23] F. G. S. L. Brandao, A. W. Harrow, and M. Horodecki, ArXiv e-prints (2012), arXiv:1208.0692 [quant-ph].

[24] F. G. S. L. Brandão, A. W. Harrow, and M. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 170502 (2016).

[25] Y. Nakata, C. Hirche, M. Koashi, and A. Winter, ArXiv e-prints (2016), arXiv:1609.07021 [quant-ph].

[26] H. Li and F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 010504 (2008).

[27] Z.-W. Liu, C. Perry, Y. Zhu, D. E. Koh, and S. Aaronson, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 012347 (2016).

[28] X. Hu and Z. Ye, Journal of Mathematical Physics **47**, 023502 (2006).

[29] A. E. Rastegin, Journal of Statistical Physics **143**, 1120 (2011).

[30] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).

[31] R. Islam, R. Ma, P. M. Preiss, M. Eric Tai, A. Lukin, M. Rispoli, and M. Greiner, Nature **528**, 77 (2015).

[32] S. G. Hoggar, Eur. J. Combinator. **3**, 233 (1982).

[33] J. M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A. J. Scott, and C. M. Caves, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 2171 (2004).

[34] H. Zhu, R. Kueng, M. Grassl, and D. Gross, ArXiv e-prints (2016), arXiv:1609.08172 [quant-ph].

[35] D. P. DiVincenzo, D. W. Leung, and B. M. Terhal, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **48**, 580 (2002).

[36] C. Dankert, *Efficient Simulation of Random Quantum States and Operators*, Master thesis, University of Waterloo (2005), available at http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0512217.

[37] C. Dankert, R. Cleve, J. Emerson, and E. Livine, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 012304 (2009).

[38] D. Gross, K. Audenaert, and J. Eisert, J. Math. Phys. **48**, 052104 (2007).

[39] A. Roy and A. J. Scott, Des. Codes Cryptogr. **53**, 13 (2009).

[40] D. Ding, P. Hayden, and M. Walter, ArXiv e-prints (2016), arXiv:1608.04750 [quant-ph].

[41] D. Weingarten, Journal of Mathematical Physics **19**, 999 (1978).

[42] B. Collins, International Mathematics Research Notices **2003**, 953 (2003).

[43] B. Collins and S. Matsumoto, Journal of Mathematical Physics **50**, 113516 (2009).

[44] P. Zinn-Justin, Letters in Mathematical Physics **91**, 119 (2010).

[45] Every element of the symmetric group can be uniquely decomposed into a product of disjoint cycles (up to relabeling).

[46] C. Lancien, Random Matrices: Theory and Applications **05**, 1650011 (2016).

[47] B. Collins and P. Śniady, Communications in Mathematical Physics **264**, 773 (2006).

[48] F. G. S. L. Brandão, A. W. Harrow, and M. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 170502 (2016).

[49] M. B. Hastings and A. W. Harrow, Quantum Info. Comput. **9**, 336 (2009).

[50] E. Lubkin, Journal of Mathematical Physics **19**, 1028 (1978).

[51] S. Lloyd and H. Pagels, Annals of Physics **188**, 186 (1988).

[52] P. Hayden, D. W. Leung, and A. Winter, Communications in Mathematical Physics **265**, 95 (2006).

[53] G. Smith and D. Leung, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 062314 (2006).

[54] S. K. Foong and S. Kanno, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1148 (1994).

[55] J. Sánchez-Ruiz, Phys. Rev. E **52**, 5653 (1995).

[56] S. Sen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1 (1996).

[57] K. Życzkowski and H.-J. Sommers, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **34**, 7111 (2001).

[58] L. C. Malacarne, R. S. Mendes, and E. K. Lenzi, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 046131 (2002).

[59] B. Collins and I. Nechita, Ann. Appl. Probab. **21**, 1136 (2011).

[60] P. Hayden and A. Winter, Communications in Mathematical Physics **284**, 263 (2008).

[61] H. Zhu, "Multiqubit Clifford groups are unitary 3-designs," (2015), available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.02619, arXiv:1510.02619.

[62] Z. Webb, "The Clifford group forms a unitary 3-design," (2015), available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.02769, arXiv:1510.02769.

[63] R. Kueng and D. Gross, "Qubit stabilizer states are complex projective 3-designs," (2015), available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.02767, arXiv:1510.02767.

[64] A. R. Brown and L. Susskind, ArXiv e-prints (2017), arXiv:1701.01107 [hep-th].

[65] B. Collins and S. Matsumoto, "Weingarten calculus via orthogonality relations: new applications," (2017), available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1701.04493, arXiv:1701.04493.

[66] A. Goupil and G. Schaeffer, European Journal of Combinatorics **19**, 819 (1998).

[67] K. Davidson and S. Szarek, "Local operator theory, random matrices and Banach spaces," in

Handbook of the Geometry of Banach Spaces, edited by W. B. Johnson and J. Lindenstrauss (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2001).